The COMMUNIST

JULY

THE TENTH COMMUNIST PARTY CONVENTION

EARL BROWDER WM. Z. FOSTER
ALEX BITTELMAN JAMES W. FORD
AND OTHERS

ALSO ARTICLES ON
JULY FOURTH THE TRAITOR BUKHARIN
H. Levy's *A Philosophy for a Modern Man* Reviewed

TWENTY CENTS

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THREE NEW BOOKS OF INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

By Earl Browder

The authoritative statement by the leader of the Communist Party on the Communist position on national and international affairs, including the constitutional crisis, the Supreme Court, intervention in Spain, the Soviet Union and world peace, trade union unity, the Negro question, and many other problems.

354 pages. $2.25

●

THE UNITED FRONT

PROBLEMS OF WORKING CLASS UNITY AND THE PEOPLE'S FRONT IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM AND WAR

By Georgi Dimitroff

This book presents the position of the Communist International on the basic issues of our time. It covers all important international developments since 1935. One of the special features of this book is an analysis of the nature of fascism and a program for combatting it.

288 pages. $2.00

●

FRANCE of the PEOPLES FRONT

AND HER MISSION IN THE WORLD

By Maurice Thorez

The brilliant report of the General Secretary of the Communist Party of France to its Ninth Congress, held in Arles, France, December 25th to 29th, 1937. In it Maurice Thorez indicates the path to victory over fascism and war, and toward the final objective, socialism.

128 pages. $.20

●

Order from your local bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XVII, No. 7. JULY, 1938

The COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.
EDITORS: EARL BROWDER, ALEX BITTELMAN, V. J. JEROME

CONTENTS

Review of the Month	A. B.	579
Summation Speech at the Tenth National Convention	EARL BROWDER	594
Win the Western Hemisphere for Democracy and Peace!	WILLIAM Z. FOSTER	600
Forging the Negro People's Sector of the Democratic Front	JAMES W. FORD	615
Some Problems Before the Tenth Convention of the Communist Party	ALEX BITTELMAN	624
July 4th—Birthday of American Democracy	FRANCIS FRANKLIN	630
Bukharin—The Path of a Traitor	V. J. JEROME	642
Problems of Building the Democratic Front	HALL, ROSS, FRANKFELD, SCHNEIDERMAN	652
Book Reviews	PHILIP CARTER R. W. TURNER	667

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Send checks, money orders and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, *P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.), New York. Subscription rates: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.*

PRINTED IN U.S.A. 209

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—— Every American Should Read This Pamphlet ——

The DEMOCRATIC FRONT

FOR JOBS, SECURITY, DEMOCRACY AND PEACE

By EARL BROWDER

96 Pages. Price 10c.

Report to the Tenth National Convention of the Communist Party, U. S. A.

In this historic report, Earl Browder makes clear the main political problems confronting the people of America today. He deals extensively, in this brilliant report, with the offensive of reaction and the building of the democratic front, with organizing victory for progress in the 1938 elections, with the problem of winning America for a positive peace policy, with the question of cooperation with the Catholics on common interests, and with the building of a mass Communist Party in the spirit of the glorious revolutionary traditions of America.

Also —

Distribute Among Your Catholic Friends and Neighbors

A MESSAGE TO CATHOLICS

By EARL BROWDER

1c.

Order from your local bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

Tenth Communist Convention Disturbs Reactionary Camp. Rediscovering America's Great. Better Americans Because Better Communists. Communists Are Maturing Together With Their Class and People. Browder's Report. Fighting for Democracy and Fighting for Socialism. Becoming a Vanguard Party. Are We Sugar-Coating Communism? Are We Merely Continuing Jefferson? Guard Against All Vulgarizations. Landon Lets the Cat Out of the Bag. Can Big Business Give Us Normal Recovery? On Special Kinds of Recovery. The Way of Hitler or the Way of the Democratic Front. Congressional Lessons and Coming Elections. How Shall We Fight Hague and Hagueism? Apply Fully Democratic Front Policy. Who Are the "National Rededicators"? The Struggle for National Health. A Thomas-Lovestone Affair Becomes Exposed. The Dave Doran Youth Drive. A Party Branch Builds Daily Worker *Circulation.*

THE reactionary and pro-fascist camp in the United States is visibly disturbed by the successful new approaches of the Communist Party to the broad masses of our people. The enemy fears these new approaches and is trying to destroy them. But we will not permit them to do that. And we will accomplish our aims best by bringing to the widest masses the great message of our Tenth National Convention expressed so convincingly in the report of Comrade Browder.

It is truly a sight for the gods to watch the spokesmen of monopoly reaction, the fountain-head of fascism in this country "defend" Americanism and democracy "against" the Communists. It is really amusing, in a way, to see the Hoovers, Landons, and Hearsts grow indignant at the attempt of the Communists "to appropriate" such heroes of the American democratic tradition as Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln. For isn't it a fact that Hooverism is the very opposite of these traditions, that monopoly reaction is the worst enemy of the democracy which Jefferson and Lincoln stood for? Isn't it a fact that these traditions can be preserved and carried forward today only in the most bitter struggle against the Hoovers and Landons? Yet these people pretend to resent our "appropriating" Jefferson and Lincoln.

What disturbs and worries the enemy is, of course, *not* our "appropriation" but something else. It is our determination to join *the people* in "rediscovering these great ones of America," as Browder said; to make these heroes of the past come back to life in the struggles of the people today; to carry forward in the new world, in the world where fascism is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the main enemy, the great objectives and democratic ideals for which these heroes fought in their time. This is what worries the enemy: the resurrection of Jefferson and Lincoln among the masses; the potency of the revived democratic traditions in the life and death struggle against the Tories and reactionaries of today. And the enemy attacks and slanders our Tenth Convention precisely because it made such an effective contribution toward *strengthening* the potency of these traditions among the masses; because it showed clearly how to carry these traditions *forward,* hammering them out into sharp weapons against the offensive of finance capital, for blocking the road to fascism in this country.

When some of our opponents say that the Communists "have gone American" all of a sudden, or that the Communist Party "has dressed itself up in American clothes," they unwittingly pay us a tribute although in a rather vulgar fashion. Surely, we are more American today, and better Americans, than we were in the past. And we want everybody to know it because, we believe, it is good for ourselves and it is good for our people. We should like to have it proclaimed from the housetops that, *together* with the American working class and its allies among the farmers and middle classes, as a working class political party, the Communist Party of the United States has come to *political maturity.* We should like it to be known far and wide that the American Communists are today more conscious of their American roots than ever before; that they have become an inseparable part of their class and of their people, thinking their thoughts, speaking their language, sharing their joys and sorrows, fighting the same enemy and moving toward the same objectives; and that, in consequence, they are in a position to serve more effectively than before as the advanced sector of their class and people, as the *vanguard* of the mass struggle against fascism and capitalism.

Yes, we want it to be known very definitely that we have become better Americans although not exactly overnight. Unevenly and through many setbacks, we were moving in that direction for quite a while. Certainly, since the Eighth Party Convention in 1934, we were moving in that direction more consciously and consistently. Recall the Party manifesto on American traditions that issued from that convention. And why was that so? *Because we were becoming better Communists.* Because we were becoming true Marxists-Leninists, shedding our sectarianism and coming closer to the masses. Because, guided by the decisions of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, we have been learning to integrate the mass popularization of the revolutionary and democratic traditions of our people with the propaganda of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

As already indicated, the Communist Party was growing to political maturity not just by itself, not in a vacuum, but in the midst of the masses and with them. The *working class* was growing in political maturity and also its allies. And so did we as the advanced detachment. Underlying all of which, of course, were, on the one hand, the great changes in the world situation: the coming of fas-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cism as the main enemy, the rise of broad anti-fascist and democratic people's movements with the all-around strengthening of the Soviet Union as the home of socialism and strongest fortress of peace and democracy. On the other hand, the accumulated experiences of the last two decades—two decades of the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism—the lessons learned by the masses of our people through their advances as well as blunders and setbacks, the lessons learned by our class and its coming forward as a class, the lessons learned by ourselves. All of this, the changed situation and the accumulated experiences have contributed to this end that our people, our class and our Party are becoming progressively better equipped to meet effectively the tasks of the present period, the task of defeating the offensive of finance capital in the developing crisis and of blocking the road to fascism.

This, in brief, is the why and wherefore of our having become better Communists and hence better Americans. This, inferentially, is also the why and wherefore of the development of monopoly capital from a source of political reaction to the mainspring of fascism. *This is why the most reactionary circles of finance capital have become the betrayers of America and of Americanism.* This is how the defense of the democratic traditions of Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln has become identified with the present-day central struggle against the fascist menace—the political and economic offensive of the reactionary monopolies.

"RECOSTUMED"—comments the *New York World-Telegram* on the Communist Party as it emerges from its Tenth National Convention. "Dimitroff's Trojan horse"—adds heavily *The New York Times*. "Mental acrobatics"—shouts the *New York Herald Tribune*. "He would embrace us the better to choke us"—says the Catholic Dr. Edmund A. Walsh, vice-president of Georgetown University, trying to ward off the effect of Comrade Browder's moving appeal to the Catholic masses. "Being embraced by a bear"—writes the liberal *Nation*, which promptly echoes most of the slanders of the Trotsky-fascist agent, Max Eastman. And in the espionage nests of the Trotsky-Lovestoneites generally there is to be noticed a panicky commotion.

Combining all of the foregoing into an inimitable product of true Thomasism, Norman Thomas pretends to dismiss it all as "changes that Stalin dictates to the Comintern." Laughable but characteristic.

Worthy of note are the main channels and methods by which pro-fascist reaction seeks to counteract the powerful effects of the Tenth Communist National Convention upon the further development of the working class and of the democratic front. Such channels and methods, there are many: openly reactionary, so-called "liberal," Thomas-"Socialist," Lovestoneite, Trotskyite. All of these are in motion. And the central task of all of them, their "unifying idea," seems to be to try to construct in the minds of the people some sort of irreconcilable contradiction between the ulti-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mate socialist aims of Communism and the struggle for the preservation and extension of democracy.

Communism, they all say, is identical with dictatorship. And dictatorship, they all continue, is the enemy of democracy, is the negation of democracy. Hence, they conclude in chorus, the Communist Party's professions for democracy are not to be trusted.

We will leave aside for the moment the very important fact that all these people are to one degree or another daily betraying democracy, either by directly attacking it (as open reaction) or by trying to obstruct the coming together of the democratic forces *to meet* the attacks of reaction (as the Trotsky-Lovestoneites). Leaving this aside, we have another very illuminating facts upon which it is necessary to comment. Open and pro-fascist reaction (say Hearst and the *Herald Tribune)* attack us from the Right. They say (the great democrats that they are) that the Communists cannot fight sincerely for democracy because they believe in socialism. They claim that our ultimate socialist aim constitutes a negation and betrayal of democracy. This is the attack upon us from the Right.

Somewhat different in form (not in substance) is the attack of the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites. These try to move in from the "Left." Therefore, their line of talk runs like this: the Communist Party is fighting to defend democracy. This means defending capitalist rule. This means betraying socialism and Leninism. Hence, the Communist Party cannot be trusted in anything that it professes, including its professions for democracy. Apparently two different attacks, from two different ends. One from the Right, another from the "Left." One, in the name of Jefferson (our Jefferson, the Jefferson of the people, not theirs), tries to impugn the sincerity of the Communists' struggle for democracy because of their socialist aims. Another, in the name of Lenin (our Lenin), tries to impugn the sincerity of the Communists' struggle for socialism because of their defense of democracy.

We say again: apparently two different attacks. *But only apparently.* In reality, it is the same attack, coming from the same camp of reaction and fascism, seeking to accomplish one and the same end. It is to impress the minds of the people with the false and harmful notion that communism and democracy are incompatible. The open reactionary (playing upon anti-Communist prejudices among certain masses) spreads this notion among the widest masses with the glib phrase: "If you are a Communist, you cannot sincerely fight for democracy." The camouflaged fascist agent, the Trotskyite and Lovestoneite, spreads *the same notion* among certain groups moving from reformism to communism but still inexperienced to distinguish between the revolutionary phrase and revolutionary substance, using the equally glib phrase: "If you fight for democracy, you cease to be a Communist."

This so-called "ideological" attack has, of course, a very practical and immediate political purpose. It is to make it more difficult for the Communist Party to fulfil its main task of helping to unite labor and, with labor, its allies among the farmers

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and middle classes into the common democratic front against reaction and fascism, in the first instance, for the coming elections this fall. It is further to obstruct the firmer establishment of our Party in the camp of democracy as its most unifying and advanced force. It is, finally, to hamper the further spread of Communist ideology among the masses.

What is our answer to this attack? It is to carry the message of the Tenth Convention (Browder's report, the resolutions, the Constitution, our deliberations) to the widest masses. It is to make its message a living reality in the life and struggles of the masses and their organizations everywhere. *It is to prove by deeds that the Tenth Convention has made us all, individually and collectively, better and more effective fighters for the interests of the people and its working class, has made us more useful and indispensable for the building of the progressive organizations of the masses, for the building of the common democratic front. It is to prove by deeds that our Tenth Convention has helped us to become a bigger and better* vanguard *party for our class and people.*

* * *

VULGARIZATION of our position is a danger that must be guarded against. We have already tried to show in the foregoing that, when presented correctly to the masses, our position is invulnerable. That's why the enemy first vulgarizes our policies and then proceeds to attack.

Already we hear from various sources the "friendly" insinuation that "the Communists really don't mean—can't mean—that there is anything in common between them and Jefferson. Being smart guys and great on maneuvering, the Communists are merely sugar-coating their pills to make it easier for the people to swallow their real stuff."

This we reject unqualifiedly as a complete vulgarization and distortion of our position. This can be seen plainly by a consideration of the following points:

1. It is an established historic truth, of which we ourselves were not always fully conscious, that communism, as the most advanced social philosophy of our time, *embodies and carries forward* all the revolutionary and democratic traditions of the past. Let our "friendly" insinuators consult the writings of our teachers (for example, Lenin's famous letter to the American workers) and, in this light, restudy Browder's report to the convention and the convention decisions.

2. The struggle for socialism is a struggle for democracy. It is so historically. It is so dialectically. It passes through various stages, assuming various forms, but it is a struggle for the development of democracy to the very end, thus reaching the point of transition to the highest form of democracy, socialism.

3. The task of blocking the road to fascism, which means defending and extending democracy, is no maneuver or "sugar-coating," as any person in his senses can see. It is, in the present world situation, an inescapable *stage* in the struggle for socialism. He who has not understood that will understand nothing.

4. Nor is our conception of transi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional forms a mere maneuver or "sugar-coating." This conception is rooted in the Leninist theory of the fundamental laws of all great revolutions. Already at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist Internation, Comrade Dimitroff discussed the matter as follows:

"Fifteen years ago Lenin called upon us to focus all our attention on 'searching out forms of *transition* or *approach* to the proletarian revolution.'

"Why did Lenin attach such exceptionally great importance to the forms of transition to the proletarian revolution? Because he had in mind *'the fundamental laws of all great revolutions,'* the law that for the masses propaganda and agitation alone cannot take the place of *their own political experience,* when it is a question of attracting really wide masses of the working people to the side of the revolutionary vanguard, without which a victorious struggle for power is impossible. It is a common mistake of a Leftist character to imagine that as soon as a political (or revolutionary) crisis arises, it is enough for the Communist leaders to throw out the slogan of revolutionary insurrection and the masses will follow them. No, even in such a crisis the masses are by no means always ready to do so. . . . To help the *millions* to master as rapidly as possible, through their own experience, what they have to do, where to find a radical solution, and what party is worthy of their confidence—these among others are the purposes for which both transitional slogans and special 'forms of transition or approach to the proletarian revolution' are necessary." (Georgi Dimitroff, *The United Front,* pp. 75-76, International Publishers, New York.)

There is yet another way of vulgarizing and distorting our position. It is the attempt to represent us as having "relegated the struggle for socialism so far to the background that one needs a telescope to see it at all." (*New Republic,* June 15.) Or the effort to picture us as mere continuers of Jefferson, as developing into some sort of a Left current in the New Deal.

This is obviously a caricature. And this too one can see plainly by examining the following:

1. The distinction between merely continuing Jefferson, as the caricature puts it, and carrying *forward* the Jeffersonian traditions, applying them to the present *qualitatively* different world, as our Party puts it; this distinction may be a very fine one for some people to see, but it is fundamental none the less. It is there as a very decisive thing.

2. The vulgarizer and caricaturist choose to ignore the qualitative difference between bourgeois democracy and socialist democracy. But with us, it is a fundamental principle. That is why we see all sides of the process: the present period struggle for the defense and extension of democracy now as well as the revolutionary transition to the highest phase of democracy, socialism. The highest phase—because it rests upon the common ownership of the means of production and expresses the class rule of the proletariat allied with the toiling farmers and poor sections of the middle classes—*the true rule of the people,* the realization for the first time in human history of the Lincoln dream of government of the people, by the people and for the people. That's what the Soviet Union is realizing though it is still the only socialist country in the world and surrounded by hostile capitalist states.

3. Finally, the vulgarizer chooses to overlook the basic role of the working class in the struggle for de-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mocracy. Yet with us, it is a fundamental principle. It is everything. We see the working class taking the initiative in bringing together the forces of the democratic front (workers, farmers, middle classes), and we work for it. We see the working class and working class unity as the most decisive and eventually the leading force in the democratic front, as the main guarantee of its victory over reaction and fascism, as the eventual liberator of all the people from the oppression of monopoly capitalism. And for this we work.

These little "innocent" vulgarizations are precisely the openings for which the Trotsky-Lovestone agents of fascism are looking. They themselves are trying to create such openings in order to weaken the effects of our powerful and correct line as embodied in Comrade Browder's report, in the Party Constitution and in the resolutions. Hence, the need of guarding against all vulgarizations and distortions, the need of exposing and correcting them as we go along.

* * *

WITH the passage of the President's relief and recovery proposals a significant gain has been made by the people, and an important victory achieved against the sabotage and opposition of Big Business reaction. Yet it must be emphasized again that the measure is woefully inadequate even for purposes of immediate relief, let alone for effectively stimulating recovery. The Labor Research Association estimates unemployment in March at 16,456,000, including the 3,462,000 on W.P.A., P.W.A. and C.C.C. rolls. The farmers too will be needing more relief. And the crisis is still continuing.

As to the attitude of Big Business, it continues on strike and makes no bones about it. At the present time, it banks mainly on the fall elections (while steadily undermining wage standards) in the hope of returning a Congress that will sabotage more effectively the will and needs of the people. Listen to former Governor Landon as reported by Clapper in the *New York World-Telegram* (May 24):

"Landon says that business will be materially improved only if there is an increase in Republican representation in Congress. 'Everything is going to be held back,' Governor Landon says, 'until the people see how many Republicans go back this year.' The 1936 Republican Presidential candidate made that statement in New York. He is on tour and has been talking with a great many business men. He apparently gathered that they were in no mood to go ahead until the Roosevelt administration is tamed down."

In other words, if you want Big Business to go to work, you must give them a Republican Congress, or one made up of a coalition of reactionary Democrats and standpat Republicans. And will this give us "normal" recovery? Landon says it would. But it wouldn't.

More cautiously, and camouflaged in "economics," the same Landon view is expressed by the National City Bank in its June bulletin. Asserting that business improvement must be looked for in the general economic situation, it proceeds:

"When inventories are cut down, costs reduced [read: wage cuts], prices brought into line and profits restored [what about monop-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

oly prices?] and business men have more incentive to go ahead with plans and projects, business will pick up; demand for commodities will resume, and price recovery will begin in a normal and healthy way."

Healthy for Big Business, perhaps. But as to "normal," that is very, very questionable.

It is absolutely necessary to explode once and for all the myth that Big Business (and the Republicans) will give us normal recovery—jobs for all and good wages—once it is given a "free hand" to do as it pleases. Let us recall once more that our previous recovery wasn't "normal" either. And not because of the New Deal, as Hoover wants it; the New Deal was at that time (1932-33) still enjoying the full "confidence" of Big Business. The trouble was with the general crisis of the capitalist system. And it still is—aggravated by the economic and political sabotage of the monopolies.

Speaking of the special characteristics of our previous recovery, Comrade Stalin said in 1934:

"Apparently what we are witnessing is the transition from the lowest depth of the industrial crisis to a depression, not an ordinary depression, but to a depression of a special kind which does not lead to a new boom and flourishing industry, but which, on the other hand, does not force it back to the lowest point of decline." *

Let's hang on that because here is the key to an understanding of the present crisis and also to the next recovery. Very correctly, therefore, Comrade Manuilsky writes in connection with the present crisis:

"These views expressed by Comrade Stalin amaze one at their sharp penetration, and give us the key to a correct estimation of the developing new crisis of capitalist economy." *

This crisis has special characteristics and so will have the coming recovery which cannot be an ordinary one. This idea seems to have begun penetrating the minds even of some of the more intelligent apologists of monoply reaction. For example, Walter Lippmann, having been struck by the fact that New Deal spending and other policies seem to be doing something to the national economy, wrote as follows:

"The success of this system produces a situation in which in an important degree the politicians take over the role formerly played by private bankers and private investors. The party in power does the lending and the spending and the investing and with that power it also fixes farm prices and industrial wages. To ask for a normal recovery is to ask these entrenched politicians to abdicate, to give back to private interests a power which the politicians have acquired, and in giving it back to surrender the most perfect device ever invented for winning elections and staying in office." (*New York Herald Tribune*, May 19.)

Lippmann senses something about the difficulties of a fully "normal" recovery, about the appearance of "special kinds" of recovery. But he does not fully understand the matter or purposely distorts it.

The truth is this: no matter who would be in power today, there couldn't be, hardly likely to be, an ordinary, fully normal recovery. By this we mean the ordinary phase of recovery of capitalist economy from

* Joseph Stalin, "Report to Seventeenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union," in *Socialism Victorious*, International Publishers, New York.

* D. Z. Manuilsky, "How to Prepare a Report on the International Situation," in *The Communist International*, March, 1938.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a cyclical crisis where the expansion of heavy industry exclusively by private investment serves as the lever for raising the entire economy out of the crisis. Reasons for the small likelihood of such a normal recovery are: the general crisis of the capitalist system, and the sabotage of Big Business. A world war would make a difference. But then we would have a capitalist war economy, not an ordinary or normal recovery.

Suppose monopoly reaction should get into power a government fully subservient to its wishes, or is given a "free hand" by the present administration, would we have a normal recovery? Not at all. We wouldn't have the sabotage of Big Business but excess productive capacity and narrow markets would remain. In fact, markets would narrow down still further because the monopolies would at once proceed to enforce a most drastic reduction of the standard of living of the majority of the people. This would still further reduce mass purchasing power, thus narrowing the home market for industry. But in the attempt to enforce such a reduction of the standard of living of the masses, the monopolies would have to break the resistance of the people. Hence, destruction of democratic rights and most likely a fascist *coup d'etat*. Then we would have a Hitler-"recovery": a big jail with penal servitude for the masses. But no "normal" recovery.

Furthermore, monopoly reaction in full control of the government would at once help itself very liberally from the public treasury. It would mercilessly rob the people and the treasury to subsidize the private "enterprise" of Big Business. Again we would have spending and lending but only for the trusts. Again we would have politicians, lackeys of monopoly reaction, spending to enrich a small clique of finance capitalists and holding the mass of the people in a huge concentration camp at starvation levels.

The choice therefore is not between normal recovery and no-recovery. Nor is it a choice between normal recovery and un-normal. The choice is between a sort of recovery that would be beneficial to the mass of the people and which would further strengthen and develop democracy; and another sort of "recovery," one that would destroy all our present standards of living, destroy in the process democracy and enthrone fascism, making the agonies of dying capitalism well nigh intolerable for the people.

It is the first sort of recovery that we are dutybound to fight for. The program of the democratic front, supported by the majority of our people, which the Tenth Communist Convention pledges our Party to support with all its might, is the only road of struggle for a recovery in the interests of the American people.

We therefore fight for two things: relief *and* recovery.

Is it possible? Can we be successful? Of course, we can.

Writing on the probable consequences of this crisis as compared with 1929, Comrade Manuilsky says:

"You set yourself the question as to whether the consequences of the present crisis will be the same in the life of the peoples (as in 1929). Of course, the monopolist trusts in the U.S.A. will utilize the crisis to attack bourgeois democracy. Of course,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the entire international situation will become still more acute and the war danger will grow to a tremendous degree, yet the consequences of the crisis beginning in the U.S.A. will be, of course, somewhat different from the social and political consequences of the 1929 crisis." *

What will these be?

". . . there will be an increase in the power of resistance of the masses to fascism; this will be the case because the masses, on the basis of the bitter experience in Germany and Austria, have become clearer as to the real capitulatory meaning of the policy of the reactionary leaders of Social-Democracy. It will now be more difficult for the reactionary leaders of Social-Democracy to deceive the masses, who will make use of the lessons of the past crisis, the lessons of the heroic struggles in Spain and China, the experience of France. . . ." *

And with all these experiences, they—

". . . will wage a victorious struggle against the attempt to place the consequences of the crisis on their shoulders, and achieve new victories over fascism."*

The approaches in our country to this sort of victorious struggle lie through the present fight for relief, recovery, democracy, peace. And this is what our Tenth Convention proposes as the program of the democratic front.

Now, with the adjournment of Congress, the election struggle for the coming fall is entering a more active and intense phase. The past session has significance in two ways. It has taught the people lessons and has defined more clearly the issues. As to the lessons: as long as the masses of the people, and in the first instance organized labor, thought that merely presenting demands is sufficient to secure their realization, reaction was riding high, almost completely paralyzing Congress in the matter of progressive legislation. But when the people began to speak up, resorting to organized struggle and pressure, especially when labor was achieving a certain degree of united action (primitive though it was), the reactionary offensive was beaten back and certain modest advances made. *Hence, the united action of labor and its initiative in rallying all the people against reaction, rallying them in struggle for the people's demands—this is the chief lesson.* This means building the democratic front, and for its immediate task—the coming elections.

Congress has also helped to clarify further the central issue. Progress against reaction. Democracy against fascism. Peace against war. Make the monopolies pay for the crisis and work for a recovery in the interests of the people. The election platform adopted by the Tenth Communist Convention rests upon these main issues and lists specifically the practical demands of the majority of the people. Carry it to the masses. Organize them for struggle.

* * *

IT HAS already been observed by several progressive commentators that one of the chief weaknesses in the fight against Hague and Hagueism is the fact that the masses of Jersey City and New Jersey generally have not yet been sufficiently aroused. They have not yet really entered the fight.

But this is not the only weakness. Another one is that the character of the fight has been somewhat distorted,

* *Ibid.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rather seriously, by confining it to an "old-time" free speech fight. And the main responsibility for that rests upon those who are separating the fight for free speech from the economic interests of the people in Jersey City and in the State of New Jersey; who are separating the free speech fight from the broad political interests of the masses of that city and state; and who are persisting in turning the free fight in Jersey City into a fight against the New Deal and the Roosevelt administration. It is this distortion of the fight which militates against bringing the masses into it and which helps Hague to solidify or, at least, keep together his reactionary and pro-fascist machine.

The fight against Hague and Hagueism is a much more serious business than an old time free speech fight. Just because we are dealing here with incipient fascism, it should be obvious that the meaning of this fight must be made crystal clear to the widest masses of Jersey City and New Jersey. And this demands that the masses be enabled to see the vital immediate economic interests and the broad political interests which are at stake for them in this fight. In fact, this is how the fight began. It began as a fight against the misery of sweatshops for the right of the workers to organize into unions to improve their conditions, for the right of collective bargaining. This is how the fight must be continued in one of its main phases: as a fight to organize the unorganized, in which both C.I.O. and A. F. of L. are vitally interested. With the passage of the Wages and Hours Bill, the fight must be made to realize the provisions of that law in Jersey and to organize the workers to enforce that law by their own power, using this achievement to obtain more advanced union conditions. With this kind of a fight, the reactionary traitors in the top A. F. of L. leadership in Jersey would soon be exposed and eliminated by their own rank and file.

But this is not all. The fight in Jersey is to break the Hague machine. And it is foolish to suppose that this can be done in any other way except in accord with the general political realignment in the country, namely, the democratic front against reaction. If this policy is correct and necessary in the country as a whole, in Jersey it is absolutely indispensable. The policy must be, and this is the policy of our Party organization, to assist by all possible means the progressive forces in both major parties to come together, to organize, and to strive for common action against the Hague machine which is in coalition with the Republican reactionaries. And in the first place, the job is especially to encourage the coming forward of the liberal and progressive elements in the Democratic Party, because that is the party in which Hague has his machine.

Now, when in view of the above, an attempt is made to turn the fight against Hague into a fight against Roosevelt and against the Democratic Party as such, is it not clear that this tends to force all Democrats (with few exceptions), even Hague's progressive opponents, into rallying to their party, which means in practice, to Hague? Plain common sense would dictate here a policy of encouraging the New Deal Democrats *to come forward,* to assert themselves, to unite

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with other progressive forces, among the Republicans, labor, farmers, etc. The contrary policy of making it a war against the Democratic Party only helps Hague because there he is in control of the party machine. The policy of making it a fight against the New Deal, fundamentally wrong in itself, frightens the progressive elements in the Democratic Party in Jersey and paralyzes their efforts against Hague.

We can well understand that Landon is fishing for in Jersey City, or Herbert Hoover, or John W. Davis, or Matthew Woll. These people are plainly carrying forward the policy of the coalition of the Republicans and reactionary Democrats, the strategy of Big Business, which is to destroy the New Deal's influence in the Democratic Party and to bring to power the Republican Party, if necessary, by giving it a "liberal" face. Big Business still wants to be entrenched in both major parties. Landon, Hoover, Davis, and Woll are monkeying with the Jersey situation precisely for that purpose. That also seems to be the purpose of the "National Rededication outfit"—an outfit which will bear watching although it could hardly withstand a close examination.

But what are the broader political purposes of Norman Thomas in Jersey? Of course, he fights for civil liberties and such fights we always support. But *how* does he fight? Why is he persistently separating the free speech issue from the material interests of the masses? Why does he seek to turn it into a fight against Roosevelt and the Democratic Party when this so obviously plays into Hague's hands? Why does he associate with Landon and Hoover and Matthew Woll when this too very obviously helps Hague to capitalize on Democratic Party discipline and attachment while frightening the progressive forces in that party from the fight against Hague?

The national Democratic Party has plenty to answer for in its failure to combat Hague. We must help mobilize the widest mass demand that the investigation of Hague by the Department of Justice be started at once and with the greatest publicity. Since the President continues the "hands-off" policy, thus damaging his own standing, we must urge upon the progressive Democrats in Congress and outside to assume responsibility for breaking Hague's hold upon their party in Jersey and, above all, to bring to life and active struggle against Hague the progressive Democrats *in Jersey itself.*

In short, the fight against Hague is a fight against one of the spearheads of Big Business pro-fascist reaction in this country. And it must be handled as such—in accord with the general policy of the democratic front which is the policy of our Party organization in Jersey. It certainly must not be handled in such a way as to help Hague and Hoover and Landon.

* * *

THE NATIONAL HEALTH CONFERENCE to be held July 18-20 in Washington, D.C., under the direction of the President's Interdepartmental Committee to Coordinate Health and Welfare Activities, may prove an important stage in the developing struggle for the preservation and improvement of the people's health.

Miss Roche, chairman of the Inter-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

departmental Committee, estimated that there were fifteen million persons in rural areas, with incomes under $1,000 a year, who did not have "basic public health service, additional medical and nursing personnel and hospital facilities," and that another fifty million with incomes between $1,000 and $2,000 require "public aid in the medical care of certain illnesses in which treatment is extremely costly because of their long duration or their demand for specific facilities for diagnosis or care." (R. Duffus, *The New York Times*, June 12.)

This only gives part of the picture yet it is serious enough to call for the most drastic measures.

Comrade William Z. Foster, as is known, has done a great deal to make us conscious of the importance of this problem. And the Tenth Communist Convention has adopted a guiding line for our Party to participate in and promote the struggle of the masses for the people's health, for a workers' health program. We quote from Comrade Browder's report the following:

> "The people's health question is a political issue of major importance. Trade unions, fraternal societies, women's clubs, youth organizations, as well as the progressive wing of the American Medical Association and the Roosevelt administration, are increasingly becoming interested in it. . . . We must participate in all these progressive movements and fight for better mass health conditions, especially for city and rural health centers to furnish free and adequate medical care, and also to have the government include health insurance in the social security legislation. The people's health movement provides an important means for building the democratic front."

Through their neighborhood and shop organizations, Communists can do most valuable work to promote this health program.

* * *

THE Thomas-Lovestone "Congress" fraudulently waving the banner of "Keep America Out of War," did one good thing. It showed up the whole business for what it really was: an agency for rendering aid and comfort to the fascist aggressors. This clearly does not refer to the intentions of everyone present there. Of course, not. Some trade unionists (most of whom came there as individuals, not as elected delegates) may have come there by mistake, simply being deceived by the slogan and actually believing that this was going to be a gathering to try to keep America out of war. These, we hope, have learned by now that they were deceived. For a gathering, claiming to be opposed to war and the fascist war-makers, *which today refuses to help Republican Spain,* such a gathering, whatever the intentions of some delegates, is rendering aid to Franco, Hitler and Mussolini.

It is the plain fact that this "Congress" refused even to consider a proposal demanding that the embargo against Republican Spain be lifted. Such a proposal was adopted by the trade union delegates. And it is safe to assume that most of these delegates, excepting the Thomas-Lovestoneites, wanted the *Congress* to adopt this proposal. Otherwise what was the need of having a congress if the purpose was to work for peace and against the fascist war-makers.

The Thomas-Lovestoneite "engi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

neers" of this business sought to pacify the resentful trade unionists with the phony argument that, if the proposal to lift the embargo off Republican Spain is pressed at the "Congress," the other delegates will split away. But this in itself exposes the whole thing. If those other delegates were so much opposed to Republican Spain that they would split away rather than allow *a mere consideration* of such a proposal, then—who were these "other" delegates? If they weren't outright agents of Franco (and there may have been some), then they must have been of such political coloration as to put them pretty close to that category. What, then, is there in common between trade unionists who wish to help Republican Spain and people who wouldn't even consider (let alone vote for) a proposal calling for the lifting of the embargo against the Spanish government? Nothing in common and everything in opposition. This being the case, why should these two categories get together? Why should there be, *how can there be,* a common meeting ground for them, a Congress?

The plain answer is: there can't and there shouldn't. But, it will be said, there *was* such a "Congress." And the explanation for this is the "third" party to the affair, the Thomas-Lovestoneites. These were the brokers who tried to combine the uncombinable. They tried and failed, in the main. They will no doubt try again, for this is the group—this plus the Trotskyites—that is performing a special function in the interests of the fascist aggressors, in the interests of Franco, Hitler, Mussolini and Japan. We must therefore continue to expose these machinations, especially among the trade unionists, remembering that the fraudulent use of the banner "Keep America Out of War" may again deceive people sincerely desiring to fight for peace.

* * *

FROM a statement of the National Committee of the Communist Party (June 10), we quote:

"The Tenth Convention of our Party properly decided to undertake a membership drive to recruit 5,000 new members into the Young Communist League by August, International Day of Struggle Against War. The drive is conducted in the name of Dave Doran, who gave his life on the battlefields of Spain, fighting for democracy."

A drive in the name of a hero, a great anti-fascist fighter and leader, a beautiful example of a young American Communist. We cannot afford to rest in sorrow and sadness much as we feel the loss. We must try to replace him many times over. And we can do it. As our National Committee said:

"By turning our attention to this matter with the same systematic guidance we have learned to give to the building of the Party, there is no question but that through the concerted efforts of the Party we can help increase the membership of the Young Communist League from 20,000 to 25,000 by the above date."

Let us do it. Let us also carry forward in true earnest another decision of our convention: the building of our press, the mass circulation of our daily papers. If we go about it systematically, we will accomplish our aim.

Here is an example of a Party branch in the Bronx, New York, try-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing to do the job. We quote from the June issue of the *Party Organizer,* a little item by Comrade Philip Quart.

"We had a *Daily Worker* Training School for the purpose of developing comrades to organize the promotion of the circulation of the *Daily Worker* in the sections, units and branches. One session was devoted to a practical study of canvassing for the *Daily Worker.*"

A pretty good beginning, we should say. Then—

"We drew up a leaflet, linking up the *Daily Worker* with the immediate problems facing the people of the neighborhood: jobs, relief, the housing and rent problem and Negro discrimination. This leaflet was distributed Sunday morning, May 1."

The further you read, the more interesting it becomes.

"The next evening ten comrades of the class, paired off in five committees of two comrades each, a man and a woman. Each committee chose a particular house. Then several copies of the *Daily Worker* were distributed among us. We went out to canvass for home delivery subscriptions. An hour later we came together to report."

And what did they report?

"From the sixty families we had time to see we received nineteen subs. Eight others were regular readers of the *Daily Worker* and *Sunday Worker* which they bought at newsstands. Four names were brought in of people who are prospective recruits to the Party and three names for Y.C.L. membership."

This is only one of many similar experiences. This is quoted, not as a blueprint, but to show what can be done once we set ourselves earnestly and *planfully* to do it.

This is now the job.

A. B.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUMMATION SPEECH AT THE TENTH NATIONAL CONVENTION*

By EARL BROWDER

COMRADES, we have worked hard for five days, and I think that our work will bear fruit. Our convention has registered its message in the working class of America and throughout the entire country. The whole thinking population of America will be engaged in the next weeks in evaluating our convention. We ourselves must begin to form our judgments upon our convention as we close our work to go back to our states and cities.

A few things we can already say about our convention with a certain degree of assurance. We can say that this convention registered the coming to maturity of our Party in American political life. Our Party has not been concerned in this convention with the details of our inner Party organization, with the wranglings between individuals or groups, or with the small problems that are of interest only to our Party or its immediate sympathizers. The dominating theme of this convention, that which stood out above everything and determined everything here, was the problems of the fate of the whole American people. And the fate of the entire world.

We were not examining these problems merely as spectators, as people with an intellectual curiosity, to find out what is going to happen to America and to the world. We have been examining these problems with the understanding that we will have something to say about what happens to America and to the whole world. That is what I mean when I speak of the growing maturity, the coming to a full, mature, political life of the Communist Party of the United States.

A second thing we can say about our convention, in keeping with our broad, clear, democratic program, is that we have conducted the work of this convention on the basis of democracy—not a mere conventional democracy, not a mere surface observance of certain rules inherited from the past, but the living democracy of collective work as we have learned the meaning of collective work from our great teachers, Lenin and Stalin.

A great democratic program can only be carried out by thorough, complete, democratic organization, and one of the outstanding features of this convention was a demonstration to the whole world that the fullest and most complete democracy is precisely the instrument for obtaining the fullest and most complete and most enthusiastic unity. I think everyone in this convention has not only had the benefit of the words and the opinions

* Closing address delivered at the Tenth National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., in New York, May 31, 1938.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of others; every man and woman in this convention has had opportunity provided in an organized fashion to make his or her contribution to the whole convention. And it is this great collective contribution of more than 700 delegates from all over the Union that has been the power behind this great Tenth Convention.

I do not think there is another organization of any kind in the United States that could point to so complete an example of the practical working out of democracy as this convention has shown. I do not think there is a single delegate in this hall who came to this convention with something on his heart, with something on his mind, that he needed to clear up with the cooperation of all his fellows, who is going to go away from this convention unsatisfied. I do not think there is anyone who came here with something he felt must be said, who will go away feeling that his thought was not adequately expressed. Am I correct on that? *(Thunderous applause—"yes—yes.")*

I could speak at great length upon this subject, a subject that is nearest to my heart—the mastering of this great problem of how to make democracy work. By learning how to make democracy work in our Party and how to make democracy work in the mass organizations of the people, we are going to master the lesson of how to make democracy work in the government of the United States.

There is just one more feature of our convention I want to speak about, and I know very well that I am ignoring very many important and outstanding features of this many-sided convention. But I want to speak about the importance of the participation in this convention of our delegations from the Southern state and the significance this has for all of America, the significance this has in the further maturing of the Negro liberation movement.

The South in America has for generations been the stronghold of reaction, the one place in America where modern capitalism was fused—in its most parasitic aspects—with remnants of feudalism, of pre-capitalist society; and on the basis of that fusion of parasitic capitalism and pre-capitalist survivals, the South has played a deadly role in the political life of all America.

But that old "solid South" is melting away. We see the signs of it not only in those great political developments I spoke of in my report, but we know how to evaluate the significance of the appearance of even a small Communist Party. We know the enormous significance of the appearance at this convention of a delegation from the states of the South, which took place right along side by side with the delegations from all over America, and dealt with the problems of the South in exactly the same way and with the same perspective that our Party is dealing with the problems of all America.

We must draw a certain conclusion from that for the political perspective for all America. I want to speak about a certain phase of our work which is of the most burning significance for the people of every part of the country—that is, the organization of the Negro liberation movement to involve the whole mass of the Negro people. This movement embraces the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great majority of the Negroes in the North. It is only beginning to embrace the main masses of the Negroes there, where the Negroes have their feet upon the ground, on the land, down South.

Important as our work is among the Negroes in the North, let us never forget that this work gets its main importance because it gives us channels to reach and organize and rouse the main mass of the Negro people on the land in the Southern states. And we who want to change the course of our country, who want to turn our country away from that path that is charted out for it by the economic masters of our land, who want to block once and forever the road to reaction and fascism, if we are really practical politicians, we must keep our eyes on the South. Not only our Southern comrades, but the entire Party has the task to win the South for the democratic front.

Next year we will have our twentieth birthday party. Our Party will be twenty years old in 1939. Our Party has had quite a checkered history and has passed through a protracted childhood. That is past. But we don't forget the tremendous political lessons that must be learned by all the new tens of thousands that are streaming into our Party, from the past of our Party. The history of our Party must be made the living possession of every Communist in America, and going from this convention, let us focus our eyes on the twentieth anniversary and make the period from now to the twentieth anniversary of our Party a period of the education of our Party in the lessons of its own history.

Anniversaries are very valuable things. They are periods of stock-taking and revaluation periods from which we draw most profound lessons from our experiences. You remember the great political fruits that we got out of our campaign of the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Constitution of the United States. We can draw the same kind of fruits from our coming observance of the twentieth anniversary of the Communist Party. This is necessary if we are to equip our Party to meet the tremendous responsibilities that it has taken upon itself.

Enthusiasm is a splendid thing, and a very necessary thing. But enthusiasm alone is nothing, and enthusiasm which is not disciplined may even become dangerous. The basis of discipline is knowledge, and we must discipline our great and growing Party with the knowledge of its own history and how we came to be what we are. And the only way in which we can do that is to master the basic theories of Marxism-Leninism.

That is the great task before us, which brings me to another point that I want to emphasize very briefly—study and school work. This year marks the fifteenth anniversary of our Workers School, a tremendously important institution, the work of which has played quite a role in making such a convention as this possible; it has blazed the way for the great crop of schools that are growing up all over our country. We should prepare to give a fitting anniversary celebration to the Workers School, to show how much we appreciate it and understand what it has done. But again, I always want to say when I speak of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

schools, that schools are mainly important as places that teach people how to study outside of school, and the task of each and every one of us is to study, study, study.

Anyone who gets so deeply involved in detailed work that he never finds the time to study will quickly find he has lost his way in the details of his work. You cannot properly direct any detailed work unless you are constantly increasing your knowledge and mastery of theory.

The next point I want to speak about is the significance of this convention of the appearance of the fraternal delegates from some, I believe eight, countries. Our comrades from other lands, by their presence here, have added something of inestimable value to all of our work. Their being here has permeated this convention from beginning to end, with the spirit of international solidarity, of international brotherhood of the workers of all lands. I don't have to use our time, as we are prepared to close this convention, to send flowery bouquets from us to our leading comrades in all the various Parties. That is important also. And this convention has already recognized the importance of that.

But in speaking of the enormous significance of the number of delegates from our brother Parties here, I only want to try to give some expression to the fact that we have realized something out of this. It has deepened all of our thought and all of our work, it has welded this convention together and steeled its unity even more than would have been possible without their presence here among us. And especially is this true of our comrade from France, who by his presence here is restoring the old traditional association of the French and the American peoples that we want to develop more and more.

Especially is this true of our comrades from the Latin American countries, whose peoples are rising in growing movements in the same direction in which the democratic masses of the United States are going. We know very well that the United States cannot take this path successfully, unless we help these forces in the Latin American countries to draw their peoples onto the same path, hand in hand with us. And their presence here among us is a sign that we are going to succeed in welding the continental unity of the democracies of the Americas.

It would be impossible to close this convention without a special word for our Filipino brothers. They are here from half way around the world, to be with us in this convention, and they represent a Party which, though small, is one of the classical examples of the self-sacrifice and heroism that lays the foundation for a Communist Party. The crimes of American imperialism in the past has bound our fate with that of the Filipino people, and the struggle for Filipino freedom and independence becomes an organic part of the struggle for democracy in the United States.

We have missed very much from our sessions here the face of our good, old-time friend, Tim Buck, from Canada; but we have been very glad that we had four of Buck's closest collaborators with us. Our Canadian brother Party is facing the opening of a Central Committee Plenum in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a few days, and right at this same time Comrade Buck was called to the capital of Canada to give advice to the Royal Commission that is re-examining the Constitution of the Dominion.

One other features of our deliberations, something that has colored all our thoughts and feelings, something that has served further to steel us for the tasks and struggles to come, was the sad news about our dear Comrade Doran, who symbolized the hundreds and hundreds of the best boys America ever produced, the boys who have written one of the most glorious pages of all history on the battlefields of Spain.

We must from this convention go out with a great crusade to assure that America as a whole is going to justify the sacrifice of these boys, by throwing the power of American behind the cause of democracy, represented by Republican Spain. And as we do this great political task, as we take up that enormous task of helping the Chinese people move more quickly towards their inevitable victory, let's also remember that in the weeks immediately before us, all friends of Republican Spain have a special task in making a great drive to enable the Friends of the Lincoln and Washington Brigade to meet their growing responsibilities. There are a number of American boys wounded and incapacitated who are preparing to come home. Some of them are already in France. The Friends of the Lincoln-Washington Brigades must and will take care of these boys. And I hope that when their special appeal goes out in the next few days it will find a hundred per cent response from every committee and every branch of the Communist Party of the United States.

Our Young Communist League, that is, the youth delegation in this convention, has very properly and fittingly proposed that the Party should assume a special task in helping to build up the Y.C.L.; our Party should engage in a recruiting campaign for young people in the League in honor of the memory of Dave Doran. A Party that recruited 25,000 members in the course of its recruiting drive, if it would turn its hand to the matter—a little more energetically, could bring 5,000 members into the Y.C.L. in the next few weeks.

Finally, just a word about the perspective of building our Party. A year ago if we got in 5,000 new members in a chunk, it looked like a great big number, didn't it? But today 5,000 doesn't look so big. Before the month of June is over, I am sure that we shall have passed the hundred thousand mark, counting Party and Y.C.L. The first hundred thousand is the hardest. The second hundred thousand should come in easy.

I don't want to set any quotas for you, but I wonder, if we would all turn some serious attention to the question, how many months it would take for us to get that second hundred thousand. And we have the perspective before us now of growing in terms of hundreds of thousands.

But again, we have to check our enthusiasm a little bit and discipline it in order to remind ourselves that we are not going to get the hundreds of thousands of new members in our Party until we first learn to do something we haven't yet learned; we

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

haven't learned how to circulate in hundreds of thousands our *Daily Worker, Midwest Daily Record* and *People's World.* This is the weakest spot in all of our work, the circulation of our daily press, something which we cannot congratulate ourselves on at all. This is one of the things that we must keep in our minds as we go away from our convention. And unless this is in your minds, the convention has failed in one of its central tasks.

There isn't much more to say except this: I think that we all agree, and I am only speaking what you all have been thinking. As we turn from this Tenth Convention to go to our places of work throughout the country, we are going with a feeling that behind us is a tremendous power, that we represent a power of the growing mass movement coming from the people. By our work, and by the message that we will take from this convention to the workers, the broadest masses of the American people, we are going to strengthen that mass movement of the people, give it organizational form and consciousness, and lead it to the victory, the final victory of democracy in America, which means the victory of socialism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WIN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE FOR DEMOCRACY AND PEACE!*

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

PART I

THE PROBLEM AS A WHOLE

(A) THE FASCIST-WAR THREAT

THE danger of fascism and war, precipitated by the offensive of the Germany-Japan-Italy fascist alliance, hangs over the whole Western Hemisphere, as over the rest of the world. To defeat this menace there is the most urgent necessity for all the democratic peoples of North, Central and South America, comprising 22 countries with some 250,000,000 people, to cooperate against the universal war-making fascist enemy. This joint action by the American peoples should have the two-fold object of assuring democracy and peace throughout our continents from Hudson Bay to Tierra del Fuego and of bringing the united power of all the nations of the Western Hemisphere into collaboration with the peace-loving peoples on other continents to quarantine the fascist war aggressors and to maintain world peace.

During the past few years, especially since the rise of Hitler and the formation of the Berlin-Rome-Tokio alliance, the danger of fascism and war has grown strong and menacing throughout the Western Hemisphere. In Canada the reactionaries are consolidating their forces, especially in Quebec, and to a lesser extent in Ontario, where, under the leadership of Duplessis and Hepburn, the two provincial governors, open fascist activities are being carried on. And in the United States we are well aware of the fascist danger, with the intense offensive of Wall Street against the toiling masses, the bitter attack against Roosevelt and the New Deal, the openly fascist agitation of Hearst and Co.

But when we turn towards the Latin American countries to the south we find the fascist-war danger extremely acute. In nearly every country below the Rio Grande there are active and malignant fascist movements. In Brazil, a country larger than the United States and containing 47,000,000 inhabitants, the Vargas fascists have succeeded in setting up the first fascist dictatorship in this hemisphere. In Mexico the fascist General Cedillo, instigated by German fascism and

* Based on a speech delivered at the Tenth Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., New York, May 28, 1938.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

counting on the help of the British oil monopolists, took up arms against the Cardenas government, with the aim of suppressing the growing national liberation movement of the people and of turning Mexico into a second Spain. In Argentina, the fascist Uriburistas and the followers of Governor Fresco in the Province of Buenos Aires are endeavoring to swing the reactionary Ortiz government to their fascist policies. In Chile, the notorious Nacistas Party and the fascist elements led by Gustavo Ross are conspiring to stop the progress of the People's Front by civil war. Similar fascist movements, in varying degrees of development, are to be found in all other Latin Amercan countries.

The fascist-war danger in Latin America comes chiefly from the militant drive of German, Japanese and Italian imperialism to seize the rich resources of Central and South America—oil, iron, copper, manganese, nickel, nitrates, rubber, timber, sugar, grain, meat, tobacco, etc.—that the fascist dictatorships need so badly in their plans of world conquest. The subjugation of Latin America has become a central part of the general plan of the allied fascist powers for world imperialist domination.

The three fascist world powers have strong groups of nationals in Latin America, as bases of operation. Thus, in Brazil there are 1,500,000 Italians, 800,000 Germans, and 270,000 Japanese. In Argentina and other countries of South America there are also large population blocks of Italians, Germans and Japanese, and their numbers are being steadily increased by organized, selected colonization.

The penetration offensive into Latin America by the three allied fascist powers is economic, political, military, and "cultural." In their drive for markets the Germans, Japanese and Italians, from 1929 to 1936, succeeded in raising their proportion of imports into Latin America from 17 to 28 per cent, while that of British and American imperialisms declined accordingly. Everywhere the fascist powers are carrying on active propaganda, one of the many sinister developments being the so-called Pan-Latinism movement, financed by Italy, which seeks to make Rome the cultural center of the whole Latin world. Likewise, General Franco of Spain is trying to exploit the old Mother Country tradition to further his fascist propaganda in Latin America. The fascist bloc of powers is also openly collecting stores of arms and establishing air bases. All its activities aim at the overthrow of the existing governments and the setting up of European-controlled fascist dictatorships. The recent unsuccessful Nazi-Integralista uprising in Brazil indicates where the Berlin-Rome-Tokio policy leads to.

The German-Italian-Japanese fascist triangle is the main force endeavoring to foist fascism upon Latin America. The ultra-reactionary elements of British and American finance capital also have a hand in promoting this fascist game. For many years past these imperialist sharks have been manipulating the governments of Latin America and robbing the people. In this spirit the Guggenheim interests are now vigorous supporting the Ross fascist presidential ambitions in Chile, the American meat packing companies are helping organize the fascists in Argentina, American con-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cerns are aiding Vargas in Brazil, American sugar interests are the mainstay of the tyrant Batista in Cuba. Similar activities are being carried on by the Bond and Share, the United Fruit Company, and other powerful American enterprises in various countries. In Mexico, British and also certain American Tory interests are plotting to overthrow the advanced democratic Cardenas government. Significantly, many airplanes of Cedillo, the fascist bandit in Mexico, were of American make and delivered by American aviators, resulting in condemnation by President Roosevelt.

The development of fascism in Latin America is facilitated by the prevailing latifundia, or big land-owning system, and the relative weakness of the working class numerically and organizationally. The great land-owners and the Catholic hierarchy, long basic sources of the traditional Latin American dictators, readily join forces with one or another of the several imperialist powers fighting like wolves over the resources and destinies of the Latin American peoples. More and more their activities assume a fascist character.

Further feeders to fascism in Latin-America are the Trotskyites and other "Left" adventurists. Throughout Latin America there are present Trotsky agents (let it not be forgotten that Trotsky himself is in Mexico City), and with their opposition to the People's Front, their demagogic "Left" proposals, and their splitting tactics, they help the fascist barbarians. The vigorous condemnation of Trotsky by the Mexican General Confederation of Labor shows the alertness of the workers to this danger.

The rise of the fascist danger in the Americas signifies also an increasing menace of war, because fascism and war are inseparable. Fascism cultivates antagonisms between the Latin American governments and is fomenting a renewal of the Bolivia-Paraguayan war. We have also seen that foreign fascist influence was mainly responsible for many Latin-American countries supporting Mussolini's murderous incursions into Ethiopia and the Hitler-Mussolini invasion of Spain. Moreover, the militant offensive of German, Japanese and Italian fascism in Latin America vastly sharpens the danger of war between these imperialist powers and the United States. A new world war may easily begin in Latin America.

(B) THE ANTI-FASCIST, ANTI-WAR MOVEMENT

If, under the Rome-Berlin-Tokio drive, the fascist-war forces are growing in the countries making up the Western Hemisphere, the forces of democracy and peace, as a reaction to the fascist offensive, are also increasing rapidly. The struggle of the great majority of the American peoples against the fascist-war menace constantly becomes more acute, widespread, and effective.

In South and Central America there are many broad popular anti-fascist movements. These have the character of national liberation struggles to preserve the national independence and freedom of the people in the face of the attempts of fascist imperialists to subjugate these countries. In Chile, a country of 3,500,000 inhabitants and rich resources, there is a strong Popu-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lar Front movement, the first to be organized in Latin America, consisting of the Radical Party, the Socialist Party, the Communist Party, the trade unions, and other organizations; it is a real political power, with a chance to win the presidency next year. In Argentina, despite the repressions of the Ortiz government, there are the beginnings of a strong Popular Front movement among its 13,000,000 people. In Brazil, the anti-fascist forces suffered a setback by Vargas' defeat of the National Liberation Alliance, the arrest of Prestes and the establishment of a fascist dictatorship; but this defeat can be only temporary as the present mood of the Brazilian people evidences. In Cuba the People's Front movement expands rapidly. In such countries as Uruguay, Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Puerto Rico (and also in the far-off Philippines) the anti-fascist national liberation movement is also growing. It is all being given a powerful stimulus by the victories of the People's Front in Mexico, which is serving as an inspiration to all the American peoples. In none of the Latin American countries could the present-day dictators, natural tools of the fascists, be elected by an honest popular vote.

In North America, the forces of democracy and peace are much stronger and better organized than in Central and South America (for definite historical reasons). In Canada, with its 10,000,000 people, the People's Front movement is making steady progress. This is expressed by the maintenance of cooperative unity between the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. in the Trades Congress, the expansion of the Social Credit movement in the West, and the growth of the Communist Party which, with its almost 20,000 members, is, population considered, numerically stronger than the Communist Party in the U.S.A.

In the United States, as we know, the democratic groupings of the people are powerful and are on the forward march. They are expressed by the development of the progressive forces around the Roosevelt administration and the growth of the C.I.O., the expansion of the youth, women's, peace, Negro and other popular movements and, not least, the recent rapid growth of the Communist Party and Young Communist League to a total of over 90,000 members.

In Mexico, a land of rich resources and 18,000,000 people, the forces of democracy and peace are even further advanced, with the progressive Cardenas government relying on the People's Front, the establishment of the broad revolutionary party of Mexico, the building up of the militant Mexican Confederation of Labor, the growth of organization among the peasants, and the rise of the Communist Party, embracing 25,000 members, to a position of decisive political importance.

North America, despite the presence of a serious fascist menace within its confines, constitutes a strong fortress of democracy. In its three main countries, the United States, Mexico and Canada, we see that the democratic-peace mass organizations of the people are strong and flourishing, while the Communist Parties are a swiftly growing force. All of which places a great responsibility upon the democratic nations and organizations of North America to lend a helping

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hand to the peoples of Central and South America, who have less organization and are harder pressed by the fascist-imperialist barbarians.

(c) THE INTER-CONTINENTAL DEMOCRATIC FRONT

The development of cooperative action between all the peoples of the three Americas for democracy and peace and against the common menace of fascism and war is imperatively necessary. Such cooperation is facilitated by a whole series of favorable conditions, mainly: the scores of countries constitute one great geographical unit stretching from the Arctic Ocean almost to the Antarctic Ocean; they are bound together by a network of economic, political and cultural relationships, and they have a long record of working jointly for various purposes; they have a common pioneer heritage of having carved their various countries out of the primeval wilderness; they are not so inflamed against one another by intense national hatreds and clashing imperial interests as are the European states (for the most part the countries have unfortified frontiers); they all have the republican form of government, except Canada, which is nevertheless a democratic country; and, lastly, they have the common national tradition of having set up their independent governments in revolutionary struggles against feudalistic European monarchies.

We should seek to develop Western Hemisphere cooperation for democracy and peace along three principal channels:

The first way is by common action of all the governments of the two continents through various pacts and agreements directed against fascist attempts to destroy the liberties and peace of the peoples of the New World, and also against the fascist-war makers on a world scale.

The states of this hemisphere, even though under pressure of imperialist domination, have frequently acted together on various matters. As long as a century ago a congress of all Latin American nations, proposed by the celebrated patriot of Latin America, Simon Bolivar, was held in Panama. In 1890 the Pan-American Union was organized, and it has, from time to time, drawn into joint activity every government in our hemisphere. It has become a sort of Pan-American League of Nations.

From the outset, however, the Pan-American Union has been dominated by the United States and used in the past largely as an instrument to further the interests of American imperialism. This must be changed. The democratic-peace demands of all the American peoples must be made to prevail in the Pan-American Union. Steps in the right direction were the proposal of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull at the Buenos Aires conference in December, 1936. The Pan-American Union will hold its next conference in Lima, Peru, in December of this year. At that time the united forces of the democratic movements of the three Americas should come forward unitedly against fascism and war.

A problem in this general respect is to draw Canada more into the cooperative efforts of the peoples of this hemisphere. Hitherto Canada has

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stood somewhat apart, because British imperialism fears that Canadian participation in such activities would weaken Canada's bonds to the Empire and throw that country dangerously within the orbit of the United States. Despite these imperialistic fears, the Canadian people should bring the strong support of their democratic country actively into the struggle of the peoples against fascism and war throughout these two vast continents.

The second type of hemisphere-wide collaboration for democracy and peace should be developed directly between the mass organizations of the toiling, progressive peoples, that is, between their political parties, trade unions, farmer organizations, cooperatives, peace societies, student bodies, cultural organizations, etc., etc. Such cooperation of mass organizations also corresponds with the experiences and tendencies of the peoples in our two continents. From time to time for many years past, there have been various conferences and conventions for economic, political, educational, and social purposes which have drawn together representatives from many of the countries. These gatherings have come to be considered natural and normal expressions of the growing bonds between the many nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Several such broad mass conferences are now being organized on the two continents. Among these is the Democratic Continental Congress, called by the Batllista Party of Uruguay, to be held soon in Montevideo. There is also the projected World Labor Congress Against Fascism and War in Mexico, which is indorsed by the Cardenas government and various organizations of Mexican workers and farmers. Then there is the World Youth Congress, soon to be held in the United States, which will draw together the young people from many countries of the Americas. These various conferences offer a valuable means to knit the mass democratic organizations of our hemisphere closer together, to intensify the struggle against fascism in the several countries, to support the advanced democratic government of Mexico, to bring pressure upon the various American governments for common democratic action, and to increase the specific gravity of the American republics in the world scales of peace. All steps should be taken to bring the fullest possible mass representation to these vital inter-continental gatherings.

A basic phase of inter-continental cooperation of mass democratic organizations against fascism and war is along trade union lines. This is also in harmony with well-established traditions. But there are great difficulties. In 1918, upon the initiative of the A. F. of L., the Pan-American Federation of Labor was formed. This body, whose principal Latin American support came from the reactionary Morones and the now superseded C.R.O.M.* in Mexico, was influenced by American imperialism and never gained the confidence of Latin American organized labor. It still exists on paper, and William Green is trying to revive it. The situation is further complicated by the C.I.O.-A. F. of L. split and by the fact that many Latin American trade unions have to work under illegal conditions. It is timely,

* Confederacion Regional Obrera Mexicana.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

therefore, that the Mexican Confederation of Labor, headed by Lombardo Toledano, has taken steps to summon a Latin American trade union unity conference. This should be a first step towards the formation of real cooperation between the trade union movements of every country in the two continents.

The third type of inter-continental cooperation necessary is between the Communist Parties of the several countries of the three Americas. The struggle against fascism and war in these countries is extremely complicated and difficult, and the only way our Parties can come forward with our correct policy of the People's Front is through close collaboration on a hemisphere scale. Considerable has already been done in this respect. There is a good working together among the Communist Parties of Mexico, Canada, Puerto Rico, Cuba, the Philippines and the United States. There is also some cooperation among the Parties in South American countries. But all this is just a beginning. There is a great need for a two-continental information center, for more inter-Party conferences and delegations, etc. In developing all this Communist cooperation, the Mexican Party, by its strategic position in Latin America, can do very much, and the C.P.U.S.A., the strongest of our Parties in this hemisphere, bears the heaviest responsibility.

(D) DANGERS TO BE AVOIDED

In furthering these various forms of all-American collaboration—between governments, mass organizations and Communist Parties—for democracy and peace, there are many serious dangers that must be guarded against. Among the most important of these are the following:

1. *Left-Sectarianism.* The most serious political error we can make now is to put forth demands of a too Left character; that is, to raise advanced slogans that the masses are not yet ready to fight for. This would split us off from these masses and expose them to the machinations of the fascist-Trotskyite demagogues. The danger is especially acute in the countries of Central and South America.

In these countries, the task before the toilers is primarily to stave off and defeat the fascist menace as a pre-condition to complete the bourgeois-democratic revolution; that is, to break up the great landed estates, abolish their political control and liquidate their many feudalistic hangovers; to smash the grip of the imperialists on the industrial life of the countries; to win for the workers the right to organize, better working and living conditions; and adequate social insurance; to achieve for the masses the most elementary democratic rights. These are the things the masses want and are now willing to fight for.

These facts must be constantly borne in mind, on pain of disaster. We must also be fully conscious that the mass struggle in Latin America takes on the character of a national liberation movement. The several countries are largely semi-colonial; their basic industries are owned principally by foreign imperialists and their governments are dictated to by these outsiders. The national liberation nature of the Latin American masses becomes more pronounced as

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the German-Italian-Japanese offensive grows more intense.

The peoples of Latin America are fighting for democracy, national independence and for control over their own industries and national resources as the economic basis of freedom. The question of socialism is still in an agitational stage among them. Any tendency on our part to forget this by coming forward with premature proposals for confiscation of imperialist-owned industry, or by failing to fight for the toilers' daily demands, or to defend the people's national independence, would constitute an attempt to leap over the stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, and would alienate us from the masses and result in disaster. It would open wide the door to fascism.

Trotskyism leads towards just such a debacle. The Trotskyites and semi-Trotskyites play down the democratic demands of the workers and peasants; they fight against the People's Front and all inter-continental cooperation that would realize the urgent needs of the masses; they ignore the cry of the peoples for national independence; they demagogically raise all sorts of adventurist demands for the immediate seizure of industry and the establishment of socialism. Thus, in the name of socialism, they confuse and disorganize the toilers, sabotaging their struggle on every front. They are endeavoring to obscure the people's democratic developments in the United States that are responsible for President Roosevelt's Good Neighbor policy, and that are creating the possibilities for a broad Pan-American anti-fascist front. In raising the slogan of Yankee imperialism as the main danger, they are insidiously spreading a smokescreen for fascist domination of Latin America. And in so doing, they demonstrate themselves to be real agents of fascism.

While stressing the main "Left" sectarian danger, we must also combat the Right opportunist danger, which assumes a variety of tendencies —surrender of the vanguard role of the Communist Party, trailing behind petty-bourgeois and progressive bourgeois allies in the popular front and national liberation movements, hiding the face of the Party, and even tendencies to liquidate the Communist Party.

2. *Hemisphere Isolation.* This is another danger that has to be fought. Throughout the three Americas, but especially in the United States, there is a strong body of opinion which, faced by the deepening crisis of capitalism and its consequent menace of fascism and war, says: "Let us save the Western Hemisphere and let the rest of the world go to the devil if it wants to." This idea is to be found not only in designing predatory circles of American imperialists who want to guard their interests from German-Italian-Japanese fascist attack, but it also prevails among many confused liberals. These people would draw a cordon around our two continents and try to isolate them from the rest of the world.

This is American isolationism raised to a hemisphere scale. It is false and injurious and must be combatted. Fascism and war are world questions and must be finally settled on a world basis. The winning of the Western Hemisphere for peace and democracy within its own coasts can-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not be accomplished so long as there is the deadly fascist threat from abroad. The associated democratic, peace-loving nations of the new world must join their forces with those of the old world to defeat the common enemy, fascism. The general aim must be for a great collective security pact between the peoples of the Western Hemisphere and those of the U.S.S.R., France, Great Britain, and other democratic countries to restrain the fascist aggressors and to give active aid to their actual and intended victims —Ethiopia, Spain, China, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, and, on our own continent, Mexico, Brazil, Chile, and other countries. Nothing short of such a world policy can possibly liquidate the menace of fascism and war in our two continents.

3. *American Domination.* American big trusts have some five billion dollars invested in Latin America, and they are always alert to defend their vast holdings. Hence, they never let slip an opportunity to try to control in their own interests the many cooperative movements that take place among the various peoples of our hemisphere. While bearing in mind the main danger of domination by the fascist powers, we must, of course, not lose sight of this serious danger.

Thus, the United States has dominated the Pan-American Union ever since its formation and has used this control systematically to advance its own imperialistic interests and to stifle the national liberation struggle in Latin America. American domination has also manifested itself in many other movements, often subtly and obscurely. In the Pan-American Federation of Labor, for example, American control was definite and effective, although covered with a mask of labor phrases. The Pan-American Federation of Labor (P. F. of L.) was formed in Laredo, Texas, and had its headquarters in Washington. Its president was Sam Gompers; its secretary, John Murray; its treasurer, Jim Lord—all Americans. Even its "Spanish Secretary" was a member of an American labor union and lived in the United States. Throughout its activity, the P. F. of L., completely controlled by Americans, carried on a war against everything progressive and revolutionary in Latin America, which was so much water on the mill of Yankee imperialism. And now we find Phil LaFollette in launching his National Progressive Party, expressing similar domination tendencies by assuming that the United States has some sort of a divine (imperialistic) mission to control all Latin America. The very preemption of the name "American" by the people of the United States is an expression of the same domination ideology.

We, especially the Communists of the United States, must fight resolutely against this strong tendency of "Americans" to control all Pan-American movements. Our policy must be based on the principle of the equality of nations, equality of mass organizations. We must combat the characteristic American attitudes of superiority and superciliousness towards Latin America. We must struggle against every tendency, however subtle, that reflects the policy of the American big trusts to look upon

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Latin America as their own God-given hinterland.

PART II

THE ROLES OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM AND AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

(A) THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Although German-Italian-Japanese imperialism is the main fascist-war danger in Latin America, it is nevertheless necessary to make a somewhat detailed analysis of the specific parts being played by American imperialism and also American democracy in the complex struggle now going on among the five imperialist powers and the peoples of the three Americas around the issue of fascism and war. Such an analysis, supplementing our foregoing general statement of the situation, demands in first line a proper estimate of the Monroe Doctrine.

The Monroe Doctrine, formulated by President Monroe in a message to Congress in 1823, was primarily, in its beginning, a measure in defense of democracy throughout the Western Hemisphere. The Republic of the United States was still young, and many new nations, nearly all republics, had just been born in Latin America. From 1810 on, Haiti, Venezuela, Argentina, Mexico, Chile, Brazil, Uruguay, Peru, Colombia, and other countries, by a series of revolutions, had freed themselves from the heavy colonial yokes of Spain and Portugal. This vast revolutionary movement, involving almost all of South and Central America and one-third of North America, was profoundly influenced by the preceding American and French revolutions and was viewed sympathetically by Jefferson and other American revolutionaries.

It was when this whole new system of democracies was threatened with invasion and destruction by the reactionary so-called Holy Alliance of Powers ruling Europe after Napoleon's fall that the Monroe Doctrine was enunciated by the United States. It constituted a notice to European monarchies to keep hands off the Americas. Jefferson had said: "Our hemisphere should be one of freedom," and it was in this spirit that Monroe declared: "The American continents, by the free and independent condition they have assumed and maintained" . . . are not "subjects for future colonization by any European power." He warned the Holy Alliance that the United States would consider any invasion of Latin America an unfriendly act, "dangerous to its peace and safety," and that this country would defend the young Latin American democracies from attack. This firm attitude, which was generally endorsed by the Latin American democracies, put a halt to the colonizing plans of the Holy Alliance.

Thus, the Monroe Doctrine, in its initial stage, was a progressive policy. Undoubtedly it helped to save many of the new and weak Latin American republics from being reduced again to colonies of European powers. But there was definitely a predatory capitalist element in the Monroe Doctrine. The bankers and shipowners of the time looked with covetous eyes upon the vast markets of Latin America, and the slave-owning planters and land speculators hoped to conquer

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Brazil and Mexico. (They seized half of Mexico's territory in 1848.) These anti-democratic capitalist forces all sought to use the Monroe Doctrine as a weapon to advance their plans of exploitation and territorial expansion.

With the growth of American capitalism, and especially with the development of American imperialism, the Monroe Doctrine, under such reactionary pressure, gradually lost its original progressive significance and became more and more an instrument for American subjugation and exploitation of the Latin American peoples. Pan-Americanism, the Pan-American Union, become a codification of domination by the United States. Especially from McKinley to Hoover, every American President, including the liberal, Wilson, constantly used the Monroe Doctrine imperialistically. In 1904, Theodore Roosevelt correctly expressed the American government's policy when he called the Monroe Doctrine an "international police power" of the United States. The seizure of Cuba and Puerto Rico (as well as the Philippines), the grabbing of the Panama Canal strip, the armed invasion of Mexico, Haiti, Nicaragua, etc., the fomenting of insurrections in many Latin American countries, the setting up of puppet dictators, and the exercising of direct economic, financial, political, cultural and military pressure in the most brutal forms against the Latin American peoples, were all carried on under the imperialist flag of the Monroe Doctrine, which finally became a symbol of oppression throughout Latin America.

(B) ROOSEVELT AND THE FASCIST-WAR DANGER

President Roosevelt's Good Neighbor policy facilitates the anti-fascist and anti-war ends of the peoples of the Americas. It gives clearer recognition to the sovereign rights of the Latin-American republics, and also makes an effort to draw together all these countries into a joint peace alliance with the United States against the fascist-war menace to the three Americas created by the militant penetration of the Berlin-Tokio-Rome powers. The Good Neighbor policy also fits in with Roosevelt's declaration in favor of quarantining the fascist aggressor powers on a world scale.

The Good Neighbor policy, enunciated in the Montevideo Pan-American Conference (1933) and the Buenos Aires Peace Conference (1936), is the expression in Latin America of Roosevelt's New Deal program in the United States. It is a reflection in American foreign policy of the great mass democratic upsurge in the United States.

The Good Neighbor policy has its historical precedent in the protective, anti-aggressor features of the original Monroe Doctrine. We have seen how that policy was formulated at a time when the score of young American republics were threatened by the reactionary Holy Alliance of European monarchies, with the United States taking the lead in the joint defense against the common enemy. And now, the many countries of these two continents are again faced with a deadly threat to their democracy and national independence, this time from the far more sinister and dangerous "unholy

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alliance" of German, Italian and Japanese fascist imperialist powers; wherefore, once more, the United States government calls upon them to unite to repel the common foe. We have also seen how the Monroe Doctrine came to be used to oppress the Latin American peoples. We must guard against allowing the Good Neighbor policy to become an agency for continuing that oppression. This can only be done by the united democratic efforts of all the American peoples.

Roosevelt's Good Neighbor policy (plus his New Deal in this country) has undoubtedly provided a stimulation in Latin America for the struggle of the peoples against fascism and war. It has at the same time given added strength to the national liberation movements in the several countries. Roosevelt is thoroughly hated by reactionaries and fascists throughout the three Americas, and by the same token, his prestige is great among the toiling masses everywhere, in that he is increasingly responsive to the anti-fascist pressure of the people.

The Monroe Doctrine, even in its early, progressive stage, contained the germ of hegemony by the United States which later grew into imperialist domination. Such hegemony tendencies in the application of the Good Neighbor policy must be combatted. The Good Neighbor policy must be based upon a free association of all the American peoples, each possessing full national sovereignty.

(c) ROOSEVELT AND AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

The present main danger of fascism and war comes from the Berlin-Rome-Tokio alliance, but we have to be on the alert to prevent the predatory big trusts in the United States from foisting their oppressive policies upon the Latin American peoples. The great American banking, oil, mining, meat packing, utilities, fruit, and shipping companies are still deeply entrenched in the economic and political life of the countries of Central and South America, and they are as ruthlessly determined as ever to exploit and oppress these peoples. The Good Neighbor policy has by no means abolished this American imperialist domination, but it has, nevertheless, through its democratic and peace features, put a certain check upon the brutal oppression of American imperialism in Latin America.

This development is in harmony with Roosevelt's attitude towards finance capital in the United States. Roosevelt is no Socialist and he does not aim at the abolition of capitalism. But his New Deal, although supporting the capitalist system, also gives some protection to many elementary interests of the workers, farmers and lower middle classes. The New Deal thus lays various restrictions upon the ruthless rule of the big banks and industrialists. It has forced these voracious exploiters to make certain minimum concessions to the toiling masses, including the right of trade union organization, some measure of unemployment and farm relief, various elementary kinds of social legislation, etc. Under the same American democratic mass pressure, plus that of the masses of Latin Americans, the Yankee imperialists are now being compelled also to modify considerably their exploitation policies in Central and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

South America. The old-time brutal suppression methods in Latin America are being changed. This is seen, among other manifestations, by the abolition of the Platt Amendment, by the withdrawal of American troops from Latin America, and, lately, by the attitude of the United States government toward the recent Mexican oil nationalization. Although considerable pressure has been brought against Cardenas by the reactionaries in the U. S. State Department; but were these the days of Coolidge-Hoover rampant imperialism American troops would have been long since sent to Mexican territory to compel the Cardenas government to reverse its action.

In the United States the Tory interests make bitter war against Roosevelt's New Deal, and in Latin America these same imperialists will fight (and are increasingly fighting) against the democratic and peace tendencies of Roosevelt's Good Neighbor policy. The American imperialists dread the growth of a great mass democratic, peace, national liberation movement in Latin America, and they do not hesitate to cooperate with local fascist elements and also with their worst imperialist rivals (Great Britain, Germany, Italy and Japan) in order to crush the growing revolt of the masses. They seek to make the Good Neighbor policy an instrument of American imperialism, as they did the old Monroe Doctrine, and they are thus bringing the greatest pressure (often too successfully as in the case of Mexican silver) upon Roosevelt to make the American government aggressively support their capitalist interests by violent measures against their imperialist rivals and against the Latin American peoples. This imperialist pressure must be offset by democratic pressure upon Roosevelt by the masses in the United States and Latin America. The fate of the Good Neighbor policy in Latin America will be directly dependent upon the degree to which the Roosevelt Administration resists this imperialist pressure and develops the Good Neighbor policy as one of real peace and democracy.

The conflict between the policies of Roosevelt and finance capital is decisive in determining the attitude of the Latin American masses towards American activities in their countries. Thus, these masses should oppose every economic and political machination of the American imperialistic trusts who are now preying upon them, but at the same time they should support Roosevelt's Good Neighbor peace policy insofar as it is honestly applied. The American colonies, the Philippines and Puerto Rico should be guided by the same principle, coupling with their demands for national independence, proposals for cooperative relations with the U. S.

There is no contradiction in this two-sided policy. It is only a recognition in practice that imperialist United States now has a government with a strong democratic trend. This two-sided policy is essentially the policy followed by the Cardenas government in Mexico, which, while it seizes the wells of the big American oil companies, at the same time seeks to maintain friendly relations with the Roosevelt administration. It is also in line with the policy of the Communist Party in the United States, which militantly struggles against reactionary

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

monopoly capital, but simultaneously supports the progressive features of Roosevelt's program, including his Good Neighbor policy in Latin America, and fights for their energetic application.

The fight against fascism and war in Latin America is inseparable from the fight against the ultra-reactionary sector of American finance capital. But in this fight (against British imperialism as well) it is of basic importance to realize clearly that the main enemy to be fought at this time is the Berlin-Rome-Tokio fascist powers. It is the drive of these malignant forces that creates the present acute danger of fascism and war in Latin America, as in the rest of the world. Hence, the main fire of the democratic masses must be directed against these aggressors. This is all the more urgently necessary because the German-Italian-Japanese fascists and their local fascist tools, capitalizing upon the justified, long-time hatred of American imperialism by the Latin American peoples, and the latter's determination to secure control of the basic industries in their countries, have adopted as their central slogan "Down With Yankee Imperialism." Under cover of a demagogic use of this slogan, they are seeking to hide their own fascist designs, thus to ride into power with their program of oppression and war. This maneuver must be exposed and the Berlin-Tokio-Rome fascist combination fought as the chief enemy of the people. Grave disaster will result if this is not done.

On the other hand, while fighting German-Japanese-Italian fascism as the central danger, the mistake must not be made of ignoring or glossing over American imperialism, of accepting Roosevelt's Good Neighbor policy as a sort of blanket to cover up the reactionary role of the American trusts in Latin America. This would be just another way of surrendering the national liberation slogans to the Hitler-Mussolini fascists; for they (with the help of the Trotskyites) would be able to appear demagogically as the peoples' champions against the ruthless American corporations. It is necessary to insist upon a true application of the Good Neighbor policy, which must include opposing the American trusts in Latin America.

Under no circumstances shall the fascists be allowed to capture for their demagogic use the national liberation slogans of the people. This would give them the masses and it would be a sure road to disaster for the democratic-peace forces. Such an outcome can be avoided only by the toiling masses conducting a fight against all imperialist influences in Latin America, not indiscriminately against imperialism in general, but with the main attack overwhelmingly aimed against the central menace, the basic source of the present fascist-war danger, the chief threat to the lives, liberties, prosperity and national independence of the Latin American peoples, the Berlin-Rome-Tokio fascist alliance.

(D) IN CONCLUSION

Throughout the three Americas the fascist-war danger is acute and full of menace: the great drive of the Berlin-Rome-Tokio powers to conquer rich Latin America; the rapid growth of fascism in a number of countries from Canada to Chile; the intensified

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"ganging up" of the fascist powers and the ultra-reactionaries of Great Britain and the United States against the popular masses when these make determined resistance; the pro-fascist activities of the Trotskyites; the open bid for power by the various imperialist fascist elements in a number of countries—all go to show the seriousness of the threat of fascism and war in our hemisphere.

But the picture is by no means one-sided. We have seen briefly how the democratic masses of the people throughout the three Americas are organizing to defeat the fascist forces: the strong popular democratic-peace-national liberation movements in many Latin American countries and the strong democratic fronts in Canada and the United States; the growing collaboration between the trade unions and other mass organizations of the two continents; the enunciation of the Good Neighbor policy and the tendency of the many American republics to cooperate together for peace —all indicate the powerful reaction of the masses against the fascist offensive and their determination to fight for democracy, peace and national independence.

It is obviously the task of all the democratic forces in our hemisphere to strengthen their ranks and to draw closer in aid of each other against the common enemy. Cooperation for peace and democracy must be intensified among the several governments, among the popular mass organizations and among the Communist Parties. The fascist foe, wherever it raises its head, must be met by the united forces of democracy, peace and freedom. Our great hemisphere can and must be won for democracy and peace.

Smash fascism through the Western Hemisphere!

Down with all imperialist oppression in the Americas; for full national independence of the Latin American peoples!

Defeat the Berlin-Tokĭo-Rome fascist alliance, chief enemy of the democracy and peace of all the peoples of the Americas!

For a democratic application of Roosevelt's Good Neighbor policy!

For the all-American people's cooperation of Jefferson and President Roosevelt, not the Pan-Americanism of Hoover and Wall Street!

Full support for the Cardenas government of Mexico in its defense of democracy and its struggle against the financiers of fascism, the oil monopolies and the Tory Chamberlain government!

For concerted action by the allied democratic peoples of the American continents with the Soviet Union and all other peace-loving peoples of the world to quarantine the fascist war aggressors!

Keep the Americas out of war by keeping war out of the world! For a great democratic front from Canada to Cape Horn!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FORGING THE NEGRO PEOPLE'S SECTOR OF THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT*

BY JAMES W. FORD

I HAVE the honor of being elected a delegate to this convention from the state of California, although actively working in New York, in Harlem, in particular. You may expect me to speak about California; but since Comrade Schneiderman, state secretary of the California Party organization, has just preceded me on the platform, I needly hardly do so. I want, however, to express my appreciation to the California delegation for my election to this convention.

* * *

Comrades, in the immediate future, large sections of the American people will recognize and hail Comrade Browder's report not only as a contribution to this convention, but as a document of the greatest interest to the entire American people.

Comrade Browder's report, so brilliant and illuminating, shows the political maturity of our Party and its growing leadership among wide sections of the American people. What American political party has produced, or can produce, a leader such as Browder—a leader who is becoming more and more accepted by large sections of the American people as a guide in political thought and action in our time?

Certain people, however, recognize this fact with regret. I feel sure that certain sections of the American capitalist press are forced to refer to Browder's contribution to political thought in America not out of kindness to Browder and our Party, but because our Party has produced a leader who answers every question that faces the people, and shows a way out. They are therefore concerned with Browder and our Party for fear the people's aroused interest forces them to be concerned.

I listened the other night to an address by Comrade Browder over a national radio hookup, as no doubt all of you did. You will recall that at the conclusion of the speech the announcer became very apologetic. It was an odd conclusion, to the effect that the broadcasting company had allowed the time because the Communist Party asked for it. The real fact is that our Party has produced a leader who is demanded by the public because he is able to answer the questions that disturb the people.

This is because our Party is based

* Speech delivered at the Tenth National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., May 29, 1938.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, whose teachings offer answers to questions for all mankind. And who better than Browder can give to the American people the Marxist-Leninist answer to their questions?

There are people in our country who boast of knowing its history. But these people again and again show that they neither know, nor care to understand, the true traditions of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. They certainly know nothing of Jeffersonianism as continued and brought to higher levels in Marxism-Leninism. Browder understands our history and our traditions and has developed them for present-day conditions. Browder has pointed out the amalgamation of Jeffersonian teachings with those of Marx and Lenin and carried them into the program of the Communist Party in the United States today. No one else in America has done this.

The second point which I wish to develop is this: the Tenth Convention of our Party shows the oneness, the homogeneity of our Party, the collective work and leadership existing in our Party. If you followed carefully the speech of Comrade Foster yesterday, you found in it a continuation of Comrade Browder's report, expressing our position on fascism in the Western Hemisphere. The speech dovetailed with Browder's; it showed the relationship of our problems with those of all progressive forces on this continent, and indicated the wherefores and the means of uniting all progressive forces of Latin America, the Carribean, Canada, and the United States, against international fascism.

Or if we take the speech of Comrade Bittelman this morning, which was a further elaboration of economic problems and of the task of Marxist-Leninist training for our entire Party membership; or if we review the work of our Central Committee since the last convention—what do we find? We find the collective work of Comrades Stachel, Krumbein, Hudson, Wortis, any many other comrades who have participated in molding and building that leadership, expressed in Comrade Browder.

Let me tell you what I have already heard about Comrade Browder's report. I had occasion to speak to a prominent Negro leader who accepted our invitation to hear Comrade Browder's report at Carnegie Hall. His remarks show how our work is spreading. This man said that one could see that the leading committees of our Party had worked together on the ideas expressed by Comrade Browder. Yet, he said, the report was given with such freshness and originality that there was rapt attention by all the leaders, as well as by the entire convention. He said the report was something new in American political life. He himself was thrilled by it. He is a man of great authority among the Negro people and in American life as a whole.

The report shows how to develop a movement of all progressive forces to preserve and extend democracy and democratic rights, in the democratic front. Comrade Bittelman developed the point: How our Party must act to make the working class conscious of its own role in rallying all those forces capable, able and destined by history and by the traditions of our country to make the country serve all

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the people. The Negro people are one of the important allies of the working class, and now a great force for the democratic front.

What has the democratic front to offer the Negro people? Well may this question be asked, in the light of the past, as well as in the urgency of the present. In the light of the past: The Republican Party has always lavished sweet words upon the Negro, but not since Reconstruction has it done anything effectively to solve the burning problems of the Negro people.

The Democratic Party has been traditionally based upon a so-called "Solid South"; but there are differentiations taking place in the Democratic Party in the South that are making it possible for the Negro people to find the way toward alliance with the progressive forces. All democratic issues of the Negro people come to the fore in the democratic front. These are: the fight against discrimination; for full civil rights and citizenship; the right to vote; the right to sit on juries and hold public office; the enforcement of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments; the passage of the Anti-Lynching Bill; and the defeat of all the reactionary forces. The democratic front will take up these issues.

In the recent struggle for the passage of the Anti-Lynching Bill, the progressive forces nationally began to rise to an understanding of the relationship of the Anti-Lynch Bill to the progressive forces as a whole: Labor's Non-Partisan League, the C.I.O., and other labor, liberal, and progressive forces. These were rallied by the National Negro Congress in support of the campaign of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. This shows the possibilities for the Negro people in the developing democratic front in our country today.

* * *

In the filibuster against the Anti-Lynching Bill, the reactionary forces —both the Republican Party and the reactionary Southern Democrats—tried to find a new way, as they put it, of solving the question of the Negroes in the South. Among these proponents was Senator Bilbo of Mississippi. We have the *Congressional Record* of May 24, 1938, in which Mr. Bilbo proposes to solve the question by the deportation of twelve million Negroes back to Africa. Mr. Bilbo goes back to Jefferson to justify this! He says there are already two million signatures of Negroes who are willing to go back to Africa. Here is a man who distorts the history of our country in the interests of the Bourbons.

There were proposals during that time to deport the Negroes to Africa, in order to solve the question of slavery; but slavery was not solved that way. Slavery was solved by the progressive democratic forces, in a revolutionary way, by civil war. We hope, however, that in the present period it will not be necessary to have civil war, civil strife, to solve the Negro question in the South: the relationship of the Negro people and the white toilers. We propose rather that the Negroes will solve their problems through the growing democratic front by joining together with the majorty of the people to defeat the reactionary forces, and to make this country a democratic country for all

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people, Negro and white together. Mr. Bilbo, however, proposes to solve the problem in another way. But today the toiling white masses of the South are beginning to understand that these tactics are not the way out for them; they will be able to solve their problems jointly with the Negro people. Bilbo says the following, in alluding to Jefferson:

"It never occurred to Mr. Jefferson when writing the Declaration of Independence, or any time thereafter, to assume the false position of recognizing the Negro upon terms of perfect equality with the white man. The Declaration of Independence was written by a white man, the Constitution of the United States was framed by a white man, and both are conceived in the interest exclusively of the white man." (*Congressional Record*, May 24, 1938.)

Mr. Bilbo slanders the history of our country, the real Jeffersonian principles and teachings. He really speaks of the reactionary minority.

Comrade Browder, in speaking of Jeffersonianism said in his report:

"There can be no social health and progress in a society where the selfish private interests of a *minority* are imposed upon the masses of the people through governmental coercion; government must, therefore, be based upon the will of the majority, democratically expressed." (Emphasis mine—*J.W.F.*)

That is the Jeffersonian idea. That is really what Jefferson meant and understood when he framed and wrote the Declaration of Independence. Comrade Browder has made it a part of our traditions today despite the Bilbos and others who speak, not for the masses of Southern toilers, but for the reactionary minority, against the democratic forces.

It is our task to follow these traditions of Jefferson and the entire progressive heritage of our country—to continue these traditions; to unify all the people, and, in the South, those two basic democratic forces—the white toiling population and the Negro people; to solve the question of democracy in the South, to join with the other sections for national unification of the country against the monopolies and reactionary forces. There is yet to be brought to the attention of the wide popular masses a "lost document" by Jefferson on the Negro question.

When we speak of the traditions of our country, it is necessary, in the field of Negro work, to delve down and dig out the traditions of the Negro people, from the revolutionary period of Jefferson and Washington on down through the Civil War period of Lincoln, Frederick Douglass, and to make these traditions inseparably a part of the present struggle in our country, and to extend them. It is necessary to clear away false conceptions of these traditions which have been fostered by the white ruling class, which have been accepted by certain of the Negro middle class, and which influence falsely the psychology of the Negro people. This false conception is based on the idea that the Negro people is an inferior race. It is used as the justification of social segregation and oppression and economic super-exploitation of the Negro. First, this conception brazenly asserts the doctrine of national inferiority, as the basis for the historic conception of the Negro which the capitalist press, the radio, Hollywood movies, and the stage have publicized. The slanderous lies of Senators Ellender, Bilbo, and others during their

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

filibuster against the Anti-Lynch Bill were no more than a flagrant distortion of the spirit of the Negro.

LET US REVIVE THE TRADITIONS OF NEGRO CULTURE

The American Negro has been popularly represented as comic; as a humble, long-suffering character to be pitied—Rastus and Uncle Tom. The Negro has been forced to play the clown. From the pre-Civil War minstrel show to today's radio comic skit the Negro has played the role of a happy-go-lucky, ponderously ignorant buffoon—a "natural" liar, a "natural" coward, "naturally" lazy.

The American Negro's culture cannot be dissociated from his struggle against slavery, and against the acute economic exploitation and attendant evils which have their source in the survival of the plantation economy in the South. The tradition of the Negro has been the tradition of revolt against his oppressors. The complete story of the slave insurrections led by such men as Cato, Gabriel, Denmark Vesey, and Nat Turner during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries is one of the chapters of American history which yet remains to be studied adequately. Historians in the past have greatly discounted both the number and importance of these slave insurrections and have in general written from a prejudiced point of view; many works on Negro history by Negroes echo these same defects. It has been recently declared by a student of Negro revolutionary tradition, Herbert Aptheker, writing in that notable periodical *Science and Society*, that "there were at least one hundred and sixty *reported* American Negro slave conspiracies and revolts between 1663 and 1865." In the post-Civil War and Reconstruction periods there is another neglected chapter of history relating to the story of the struggle of the newly-freed slaves for land and for the fulfilment of the other promises of the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

This continuous tradition of protest is reflected in the poetry, songs, tracts, and addresses of the Negro. There was Jupiter Hammon, the first American Negro poet of whom there is record, whose poetical broadsides appeared in 1760. There was George Horton, the slave poet, whose *The Hope of Freedom* was published in 1827. And there was Frances Harper, whose poems the Abolitionists found useful for their cause. Also, there was that body of anonymous slave songs and shouts, the authentic voice of the people.

David Walker's *Appeal Addressed to the Colored Citizens of the World*, 1829, was a fiery protest against slavery. The pamphlets were confiscated and destroyed wherever found. There were many others whose work was in one way or another directed toward the overthrow of slavery: Harriet Tubman, Sojourner Truth, Ruggles, James McCune Smith, Patrick Reason, Mifflin Gibbs, James Forten, Robert B. Elliott. But greatest of all was Frederick Douglass, whose speeches and writings still hold a powerful inspiration for the Negro masses.

Prior to the Civil War the Negro church was the only institution in which Negroes were permitted to organize. As a consequence, religious zeal was frequently a part of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

struggle for freedom and liberty, as in the case of Nat Turner, and religious services were often the screen for plotting against the slave masters. Among the first organizations to take up the fight for Negro rights was the American Missionary Association, which developed out of the defense of the Negroes who revolted on the high seas in 1837 and captured the slave ship *Amistad,* which was carrying them into slavery.

Following the Civil War there developed a hierarchy of middle-class leadership in the church, which was interested in its own advantage rather than in the struggle of the race for freedom, and the Negro church became in large part an agent of reaction—a buffer between the class of exploiters, both black and white, and the Negro masses. In recent years, however, under the stress of the economic depression, the Negro church is resuming its original role of militant social leadership.

It is the life, the work, the struggles of the Negro masses—in the cotton fields, on the wharves, on the railroads, in the factories—which constitute the essence of the authentic culture of the American Negro. More and more the younger writers, artists, and musicians among the Negro people are coming to recognize this fact. The revolutionary tradition, the true folk experiences of the race, are being newly appraised and utilized in all the arts. Langston Hughes and Sterling Brown have done outstanding work in reinterpreting this folk experience in poetry. Richard Wright, Frank Davis, and others make up a group of younger writers who are keenly aware of the Negro's past and present position in American history. In art, in music, in the theater a similar awakening to the recognition of the true role of the Negro in American life is taking place. Significant of this trend is Paul Robeson's recent statement, upon quitting the fashionable West End stage, for the Workers' Unity Theatre in London:

> "When I sing 'Let My People Go,' I want it in the future to mean more than it has before. It must express the need for freedom not only of my own race. That's only part of a bigger thing. But of all the working class—here, in America, all over. I was born of them. They are my people. They will know what I mean."

In general we must aim to bring about the recognition of the fact that the cultural tradition of the American Negro is basically of the same pattern as the tradition of American democracy in general.

I want to express publicly the highest appreciation of our Negro comrades and the Negro people of the splendid contributions of Richard Wright and Langston Hughes, and other artists and musicians of our people.

It is the reactionary filibustering Senators, the Ellenders and Bilbos, who are trying to distort our contributions to real culture, and to the political and social and economic life of our country. They began to be frightened by the prospects of Negroes in the Congress of the United States, as Governors of States, and in State Legislatures. The Communist Party is bringing to life the true role of the Negro people in American politics and is leading them in a concrete fashion. Who has cause to fear the role of the Negro in American life?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The reactionaries. They it is who fear that a new type of Negro will emerge and come into Congress, and we in Harlem have already given very serious consideration to this question, and we say, "Yes, we will have outstanding Negroes in Congress!" In the Harlem Legislative Conference this has been placed as a central point. We aim to bring to the Congress of the United States a Negro who will speak for his people, and for all the progressive forces in his community.

The Harlem Legislative Conference is concerned, not only with sending to Congress a Negro Congressman, but with defeating the present Tammany anti-progressive Congressmen of the 20th Congressional District and replacing him with an outstanding progressive who will be a tremendous addition to Congress, who can unite the progressives that we hope to send to Congress.

It is on this basis that the power of the Legislative Conference was organized. Spade-work was done by the Communists over a period of years. How was this done? What were the steps taken?

In the first place, the spade-work over a period of years resulted in the 1937 municipal elections around the American Labor Party in the election of a true progressive to the State Legislature.

This was assisted actively by the Communist Party and was aided by all progressive forces in Harlem, in lower Harlem particularly, which is composed largely of Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and Italians.

This victory laid the basis for the first practical steps taken following the election.

The State Legislators from the Harlem area, twenty or more, came together to talk things over. Four State Legislators—two Negroes, one Puerto Rican, and one Irish Catholic—held an informed banquet with Vito Marcantonio, former Congressman from the 20th Congressional District, as sponsor. They discussed the question of "the next steps before the people of Harlem."

They decided to call together their constituents and ask them what they wanted the legislators to do in the Legislature. The next step was to issue, in the name of the legislators, a statement to civic leaders throughout Harlem. At the first meeting of the Harlem Legislative Conference nearly every representative appeared. They listened to the people on the questions of housing, unemployment, discrimination against the Puerto Ricans, discrimination against the Negroes, yes, and even discrimination against the Italians. They listened to the people demanding better schools, raising all burning questions—the question of democratic freedom.

The State Legislators pledged themselves to go to the State Legislature and fight for these things. And they did. They fought for the principal issues of the Negro people, and of the working class. That is not all. They launched a campaign to replace the present reactionary leader in the 20th Congressional District by a progressive. Organization has been set in motion for political action. Forces are working in the trade unions and the American Labor Party to develop a united front of all forces, to elect a progressive.

The question of a Negro Congress-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man was much more difficult. A majority of the Negro people in Harlem live in the 21st Congressional District. There are nearly 200,000 voters, but the Negroes are only about 25 per cent of this total, even though the majority of the people living there are Negroes. In the upper section of the district, mostly white people live: progressives, trade unionists, etc.

This now presents the possibility of working for the nomination of a Negro in the primaries, and the consideration of an outstanding Negro who is acceptable to all progressive political groups to run in the primaries for the nomination for Congressman in the 21st Congressional District.

There are possible individuals coming forward on the basis of a program in the interests of the people. What is required is one who is acceptable to all progressive forces, one who agrees to the program of the democratic front for the people of Harlem —Negroes, Irish Catholics, Puerto Ricans, Italians.

These are some of the practical aspects in our approach to the election of a Negro to Congress—one who will be an outstanding progressive in the Congress of the United States. I cannot speak about all our problems in our Negro work. We have a similar situation in Chicago. There we have the question of the Negro Democratic reactionary, Mitchell, who is a United States Congressman; and the fact that a progressive Negro Republican has been endorsed against him. We have a delicate situation in Pennsylvania, also, which perhaps Comrade Toohey will speak about.

Finally, I think our next task should be confined to training our Negro forces, bringing forward old and new Negro forces, giving them systematic training, so that they will be able to carry out in practice and in life the Leninist-Stalinist approach to our work, so clearly mapped out by Comrade Browder.

We have splendid new Negro comrades coming forth. We must train them in the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, on how to make contact with the Negro masses, how to lead the work in their communities, how to lead branches and make them a part of the life of the Negro people.

We have just concluded a National Negro Training School, a school dealing specifically with Negro problems. We had twenty-four Negro and white comrades, from all parts of the country. We made the beginning, in an organized way, in giving serious attention to the training of our Negro personnel. Then we had Negro comrades in the general National Training School. Pettis Perry is one of these students. He spoke to you this morning. We have Negro comrades in our state, county and section schools. We must give more attention to systematic training. We must bring forward these new comrades in the light of the present situation. They must understand the tactics of the present situation: how to bring the Negro people as a democratic force into the democratic front as a whole in our country.

This is not an easy task. I think our Party has been making splendid advances in that direction. But we must continue to bring the problem forward, to bring it to the trade union organizations and industries where Negroes are not employed, to raise

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their specific problems and learn how to direct these struggles in Negro communities against the big monopolies, and against those people who try to stir up anti-Semitism. We have that problem in Harlem, and in the South Side of Chicago, as had already been reported by Comrade Childs. That is one of the problems we will have to consider in the near future. The districts are now beginning to understand and work in the Negro field, in Chicago and other places, in the trade unions and among the white comrades who are organizers in the Negro communities.

I want to conclude with a remark on the contribution of leading white comrades in Harlem, of the many splendid forces we have there. Here our white comrades, such as Comrade George Blake, are organizing and helping to develop the movement. Likewise, our white comrades in the trade unions have been working over a period of years in a manner that promotes the work of our Party in Harlem. These comrades know how to approach the Negro problem because they have worked in Harlem, and gained experience there.

Comrades, with this splendid union of white and Negro workers which our comrades are helping to promote, the work of cementing the forces of the Negro people and of achieving their alliances with the white working class and with the vast progressive movement in the land is bound to succeed. Let us go back to our various territories from this convention resolved to assist vigorously in developing the democratic front through the National Negro Congress, among Negro men, women and youth. If we develop this work, we shall unite the Negro people for the democratic front and we shall advance onward the great historic movement of struggle for Negro national liberation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME PROBLEMS BEFORE THE TENTH CONVENTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY*

BY ALEX BITTELMAN

Comrades, like the many other speakers, I should like to begin by expressing my admiration for the magnificent and masterly report of Comrade Browder. I noticed in the *New York Times* this morning that the reporter was especially struck by the unparalleled length of the report. Yet somehow I have the feeling that were the reporter free to express what he really thought, he would have said something else in addition. He couldn't help then but say that this report was unparalleled not only because of its length—that is a detail—but because of its political significance in the life of our country, for today as well as for the future.

We shouldn't, of course, restrain ourselves in the expression of the feelings which this report has inspired in all of us. But we should realize that in this document we have a powerful weapon for the promotion of the fight against reaction and fascism. We should remember what Karl Marx said many years ago: that correct working class, revolutionary ideas are very important. Without them we can do nothing. But these ideas become a power for doing things only when they get hold of the masses. From which the conclusion is obvious. We have to take this report and make it the property of literally millions of the American people. The masses are ready for it. They want it. Let us bring to them this message of our Party convention.

Now on some of the points which I intend to touch on very briefly. One is about the democratic front. Here I should first like to utter a word of caution. We should guard against permitting our discussions on important political questions, which necessarily means theoretical discussion, to degenerate into meaningless hair-splitting or to assume such abstract forms that nobody outside of our own circles can understand it. This, however, does not in the least signify that we should abstain or restrict ourselves from serious thoroughgoing discussions of our political tasks and problems at this convention. I mean thoroughgoing in the sense of *linking up the practical political problems of the*

* Speech delivered at the Tenth National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., May 29, 1938.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

day with the fundamental principles of our theory and practice.

It is from this angle that I propose to discuss just one phase of the question of the democratic front. The democratic front, like everything else in life, has a past, a present, and a future. Viewing the democratic front from the angle of its past, of its history, the thing that strikes one immediately is this: that the democratic front of today is organically connected with all the great democratic traditions of our country and people. In this sense, it is a continuation, in a new world, under new circumstances, with new slogans and methods, but a continuation nevertheless, of all the great fights which this country has gone through in the past—fights for democracy, for the democracy of the people and against its enemies.

This is the democratic front when you look at it backwards. Now how does the democratic front look when viewed from the angle of its *present* development? You see the same democratic struggle but on a wider scale, more powerful, but also (and this is essential) that it is a struggle of an *anti-fascist nature*. You notice also that *the working class* is playing a most decisive part in the democratic camp, beginning to take the initiative in rallying the democratic forces into a common front against fascism. It is with this latter angle, with the role of the working class, that I shall concern myself especially in the next few minutes.

When you compare the development of the democratic forces today in such three countries as France, Spain and the United States, what do you find? In all three of these countries you find powerful movements of the people rising against the offensive of fascism, fighting to destroy fascism, to preserve and extend democracy. This in broad outline is the thing that is common to the mass struggles in all of these countries. Yet there are certain things that are not common, that differentiate them and among the things that differentiate the democratic movements of the people in these three countries there are two: one, the relative position of the working class in the camp of democracy, and, two, the degree of anti-fascist consciousness in these movements.

Take for instance the development of the democratic forces in Spain and France. There we find the People's Front movements greatly conscious of their anti-fascist nature and, secondly, we find the working class plays in these movements not only a decisive but a leading role. On the other hand, examine the situation in the United States. Here we see various powerful forces of the people gathering together into a common democratic front against the offensive of finance capital and for blocking the road to fascism in this country. Yet the bulk of these forces is not yet clearly conscious of the anti-fascist nature of the struggle and the working class, while playing a very decisive role, is not yet the leading factor in the democratic camp. It is just beginning to take the initiative in rallying the forces of the democratic front.

Therefore, in discussing the building of the democratic front in this country, with the orientation of developing it towards a real People's Front, it seems to me we will make no mistake if we keep our eyes firmly fixed

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on this fundamental fact—*the relative position and role of the working class in the democratic camp.* In terms of practical policy, this means: encouraging and strengthening the initiative of the working class for bringing together all the democratic forces of the people in a common front, making the working class conscious of the fact that it is the decisive force in the struggle against fascism. By following this policy, we are helping to consolidate the democratic front today and are promoting its development inevitably towards a real People's Front.

As pointed out by Comrade Browder, there are two main things to keep in mind. We want to rally around the working class in America today all forces, all social groups—especially the farmers and the middle classes—capable of fighting in one way or another against reaction and against the oncoming of fascism. And we want to do it in such a way as will continually and systematically raise the consciousness of the working class of its liberating role in the struggle against capitalism, of its duty to build the democratic front and become the leader of it. This is the meaning of our message. This is the meaning of the message that Comrade Browder brought to this convention.

* * *

A second point on which I should like to say a few words is the struggle to make the monopolies pay for the crisis and the fight for recovery. Here there is one angle to which we must pay very much attention. That is: how the masses themselves feel about the crisis. Remember, comrades, that it is already ten years that this country (speaking for a moment only about our own country) has been in a condition of virtually continual crisis. It is true that we had two separate crises, the one of 1929-32 and the present one. In between, we had a spell of depression, a special kind of depression, and then a recovery of a kind. But taking the last ten years as a whole, the masses of the people cannot help but feel that things have been going wrong for practically the whole of these ten years. Things have not been normal, not as they have been in the past. It was crisis, it was relief, it was taxation—it was emergency right along.

Why is it so important to keep in mind these feelings of the people? Because the reactionaries and the fascists are trying and they will continue to try to derive some comfort from this feeling of the masses. The reactionaries are already trying to appear as those whose policies would be in a position to turn this country back to normal conditions; normal, that is, that factories would be running at capacity, workers would be employed, getting their normal wages, farmers would be growing on their soil all that can be grown, selling their products at prices they received twenty and more years ago.

I do not believe that the reactionaries can get very far with this demagogy. I don't think that they can really convince a substantial section of the people that the policies of monopoly reaction are really able to bring this about. Nonetheless, such demagogy tends to confuse the people and, should the crisis continue to deepen as it well may, because of the sabotage of the monopolists, and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should the democratic camp fail to put forward a real militant struggle for its *complete program,* there is no telling but that reaction may make certain headway among the people even with this demagogy. That is why we must have among the masses the widest possible discussion on the possibilities of normal, fully normal, recoveries at the present time.

The fact of the matter is that such fully normal recoveries simply cannot be had. If, for example, the reactionaries should through some freak of fortune, or the weaknesses of the democratic camp, get into power, they will not give us a normal recovery. Not by a long shot! What they might give us is some form of a Hitler "recovery," a Mussolini "recovery," or "Japanese-Mikado "recovery," that is, a huge concentration camp for the people, starvation as well as unemployment, imperialist war, with plenty of comfort and riches for the reactionary monopolies, and with the complete destruction of democracy. This is what they might be able to give us if we allow them to get into power. But that is not the normal type of recovery that the American masses are looking for. On the other hand, if the democratic forces consolidate themselves into a common front, pushing forward *their complete economic and political program*—the program of jobs, security, democracy, and peace—that also wouldn't give us the old-time normal recovery, but it would give us a new kind, a new type of recovery, one in the interests of the people, and with the preservation and extension of democracy. It is for this sort of recovery, comrades, that we must fight. This will no doubt be, and already is, a central political issue in the developing election campaign.

* * *

Lastly, on some of the methods and approaches for bringing Marxism to the masses and also on some methods of Party education.

It was, I believe, on the second or third day after May 1 that *The New York Times* had a long editorial on the lessons of May Day. The conclusions of this editorial ran something like this: It is true that the people in America are very much dissatisfied with conditions and are looking for new ways out. But the people are not turning to Marxism as a solution to their problem, because Marxism is alien to the American mind. The American mind refuses to grasp it. It abhors the theories and ideas of Marxism.

All this, of course, is sheer nonsense, and I will not burden you at this time with any long discussions on the matter. Except to say this, that, in our midst there may be found attitudes on this question which are not so very good. I heard it expressed, not too often, that the reason we do not make more headway with spreading Marxism among the American masses (although we are making considerable headway) is that the American people still have a contempt for all theory. I also heard it expressed, not so very clearly, that the reason we do not make more rapid progress with Marxist-Leninist education in our own Party is again because of this ingrained resistance of the American mind to Marxist theory. I wish to challenge that. I also want to chal-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lenge the attempt to justify such wrong ideas by reference to Engels. Engels never said any such thing. Speaking over fifty years ago, Engels said that there were still to be found among the American masses a contempt for all theory. But he was very quick to indicate that, for example, among the educated classes and the scholars this contempt was disappearing already in his time. He was also very emphatic in showing that the development of American capitalism, the growing class divisions and class struggles and, above all, the accumulated experience of the masses in these struggles will eventually dissipate this contempt for theory. Moreover, when Engels found it necessary to castigate somebody for the situation, he castigated the sectarian American Marxists and not the American masses. He castigated the sectarian Marxists for failure to find the specific American approaches to the masses, the approaches which would be able to lead the working class to understanding and acceptance of Marxian theory.

Why do I bring this up now? Because the situation is becoming progressively more opportune for the widest advance of Marxian ideas among the American people. Conditions are becoming rotten ripe for their acceptance—the working class in the first instance—of the Marxist-Leninist philosophy. Hence, those among us who are still inclined to hark back to the contempt for theory among the Americans are not doing a good service either to the people or to Marxism.

Second, and this is from the sphere of experience in Party education. All too often, some of the comrades, not all I am glad to say, but just some who are either directly or indirectly engaged in Party education, are still tempted to say that the reason this particular comrade in a school or class did not make sufficient headway was because he still has contempt for theory. Well, that may or may not be true in a particular case, but it seems to me that the question which our teachers must ask themselves first should be this: Have we developed a correct method for teaching Marxism? Have we made sure that the curriculum and methods which we built up for our schools and classes are such as really to enable the students to learn Marxist theory? That is, are we teaching Marxism-Leninism on the basis of the key problems of the struggles of the masses today?

To be sure, there is only one Marxism – Marxism-Leninism – the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. Only one. But there are numerous ways and means and methods to enable people to *approach* Marxism. For these approaches there is no blueprint. There is only a general guiding line, and that guiding line was splendidly formulated by Comrade Dimitroff in his summing up speech at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International.

Consequently, when we see that a student or student body finds at times that it is somewhat difficult to grasp a particular phase of Marxian theory (and this is not always easy to grasp) then instead of crying out: "My God, these people have a contempt for theory!" we should be asking ourselves the question: maybe there is something wrong with our method? Maybe there is something wrong with our approaches? And having asked our-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selves this question, we must proceed to correct our methods along the lines of our general guiding principle.

To conclude. Nowadays there is no longer even the semblance of excuse that it is difficult to spread Marxism and Marxist education. Our Party has already demonstrated that it is possible. Comrade Browder has given us object lessons. He has given us the object lesson of how to take our Marxist-Leninist theory, from the simplest ideas to the most complicated ones, and to bring them to the American worker, to the American farmer, to the American middle class person, so that he can recognize in these ideas something of his own and in this way bring Marxism closer to the masses and the masses closer to our Party.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JULY 4th—BIRTHDAY OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

BY FRANCIS FRANKLIN

JULY FOURTH is the anniversary of the coming to manhood of the American nation. The Declaration of Independence indicated the conscious maturity of the movement for national unification and for the self-determination of the American people.

All the tasks so boldly enunciated by this Declaration have still not been realized. Therefore, July Fourth can be celebrated truly only by *renewed* declaration of the effort to realize in their entirety its aims of freedom and equality. The Communist Party, inheritor of the revolutionary democratic tasks of the great molders of the American people, proudly proclaims its determination to fulfil these tasks in its major slogan: Communism Is Twentieth Century Americanism!

The "long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object . . . to reduce them under absolute Despotism," from which our forefathers suffered, is not altogether dissimilar from the "long train of abuses and usurpations" which *we* have been suffering from the sixty families who now dominate our country and who, in one way or another, are seeking to undermine the principles of the Declaration of Independence by imposing upon us all the evils of Big Business fascism.

EVENTS LEADING TO THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Great Britain in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was dominated by merchant capitalists. *The theory of mercantalism,* in operation during these two centuries, expressed the class interests of the merchants, and led to all the tyrannical acts against which our forefathers fought. This theory was that the prosperity of the Empire depended upon having an excess of gold coming into the mother country over the amount leaving the country. In order to insure a favorable balance of trade, the state power was used to force the colonies to buy British goods in British ships and to prevent competitive manufacturing in the colonies. Only raw materials were to be produced in the colonies, and these were to be shipped to Britain for British manufacturers. Thus, the English government seriously hampered the economic development of the American nation. In order to enforce this policy, the merchant capitalist class greatly strengthened the power of the state. Great Britain likewise sought to restrict Westward expansion

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in order to protect her fur trade and to make rebellion more difficult. Heavy taxes were imposed upon the Americans to help pay for all these acts of restriction. Thus began the long succession of acts of *"taxation without representation."*

By one despotic act after another, the government of George III sought to enforce its colonial legislation. British ships were stationed in American ports. Standing armies were sent to America, and laws were passed to force Americans to give the British soldiers free lodging in their houses. When colonial legislatures protested against the tyrannical acts of the British government, they were dissolved repeatedly by the royal governors. When the citizens demonstrated against the presence of these hostile troops, fights developed, and in 1770 the British soldiers fired at Boston citizens, killing five, among them the Negro, Crispus Attucks. This "Boston Massacre" more than nearly any other act helped intensify the hatred of the American people for their British tyrants.

When the citizens of Boston in 1773 protested against the tax on tea by dumping a boatload of British tea into the ocean, the British government replied by closing the Boston port. This oppressive act rallied the American colonies in closer unity as a means of aiding their sister colony in distress.

THE LIBERTY-LOVING TRADITIONS OF THE BRITISH AMERICANS

The English have always been a liberty-loving people. Their whole history has been a long record of struggle against tyranny and for a democratic constitution. The British Americans of 1776 were inheritors of that tradition just as the settlers from Ireland, Germany, France, and other lands inherited the revolutionary struggles of their peoples.

The earliest inhabitants of the British Isles showed their sturdy love for independence by their strong resistance to the conquest of Julius Caesar. Subsequently, the Anglo-Saxons fiercely fought against their conquest by William of Normandy. The Norman conquerors never succeeded in shackling the institutions of feudal serfdom on all the hardy English yeomen. In the forests of "merrie England" dwelt many a band of outlaws like the legendary Robin Hood, who preferred to "rob from the rich and give to the poor" than to live under feudal oppression.

The long fight for constitutional democracy commenced under the rule of that worst of British tyrants, the unspeakable King John. It was under his despotism that the British people won their first great charter of human freedom, the famous *Magna Charta*, which granted to the English people the right of representative government. This was the foundation of the British Constitution, developed and extended throughout the long history of England.

There followed the struggles of John Ball and the peasants; the battles of the Scotch Presbyterians; and the Great Rebellion of 1648, in which Oliver Cromwell and his "Ironsides" overthrew and executed Charles I and established the Commonwealth.

During this revolutionary period in English history, the famous philosopher John Locke answered the argu-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments of those who claimed that the monarch had absolute authority over his subjects, and propounded the theory, later set forth in the Declaration of Independence, that men are by nature born free and equal; that they establish governments in order to safeguard the possession of life, liberty, and property; that for the public welfare governments must not be changed for light or frivolous causes, but that when a long train of abuses indicates that government has ceased to fulfil its function and has become a despotism, then it is the right and duty of the people to throw it off. Locke was the champion of religious and civil liberty. Thomas Jefferson was steeped in these theories of John Locke, and it was Locke's *Second Treatise on Civil Government* which was the fountainhead for the doctrines enunciated by the Declaration of Independence.

THE GROWTH OF THE MOVEMENT FOR INDEPENDENCE

Revolutionary sentiments do not arise all at once. They are always slowly and painfully developed. It is only "a long train of abuses" which by their accumulated impact finally arouses them. There are always the revolutionary pioneers who see further than the masses, who see in what direction events are leading, but who know how to bid their time and how to organize and educate the masses for the immediate struggle for which they are ready, thus preparing the way for the really decisive struggle toward which events are leading. Such pioneers of social change are never Utopian dogmatists, but always practical revolutionary politicians. At last, there comes the time when the "long train of abuses" reaches the breaking point, and the spirit of revolution which has been maturing so slowly suddenly flares up in a flame. Then, as Lenin says, populations learn in weeks or even days what formerly they could learn only in decades. And the revolution is on.

So it was in America. America had been at war with Great Britain for more than a year before she declared her independence. When the war commenced it was merely a *rebellion* against the Navigation Acts, the curtailment on industry and Westward expansion, taxation without representation, the quartering of troops in America, the closing of the Boston port, the dissolving of the Colonial Assemblies.

The outbreak of actual war was preceded by a long series of protests. There were the Stamp Act Riots, petitions to the King and to Parliament, refusal to pay salaries to local governors, agitation and pamphleteering by such men as Samuel Adams and Patrick Henry, the organization of mechanics and artisans into such groups as the Sons of Liberty, the holding of protest meetings. But few were they, like Samuel Adams, who throughout all these events cherished the aim of independence. Even after the war had commenced, the Continental Congress addressed humble letters to "his majesty, George III," petitioning him as "faithful and obedient servants."

The ground was prepared by acts of protest from the local Colonial Assemblies or township meetings or by the convocation of local conventions; just as today the ground is being prepared for the democratic front

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the local and state elections. Finally, through the efforts of men like Samuel Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and Patrick Henry these local movements began to be coordinated through the formation of *Committees of Correspondence*. At length, the time was ripe for beginning to unify the colonies through the convocation of the *First Continental Congress*, to which delegates were elected by the colonial legislatures or by special conventions.

The past may always be learned best by reading the actual words of the men who helped make history. In preparation for the Virginia Convention to elect delegates to the First Continental Congress, Thomas Jefferson wrote a series of resolutions, which he mailed to the Williamsburg Convention, from which illness prevented his presence. These resolutions, then considered too radical by most of the delegates, were published in a booklet entitled *A Summary View of the Rights of British America.*

Speaking of the overthrow and execution of Charles I, Jefferson wrote:

"A family of princes was then on the British throne, whose treasonable crimes against their own people brought on them afterwards the exertion of those sacred and sovereign rights of punishment reserved in the hands of the people for cases of extreme necessity, and judged by the Constitution unsafe to be delegated to any other judicature."

Showing that he had some conception of the class struggle, he wrote:

"History has informed us that bodies of men, as well as individuals, are susceptible of the spirit of tyranny."

Denouncing the oppressive acts under which Americans suffered, he declared:

"By an act passed in the fifth year of his late majesty King George II, an American subject is forbidden to make a hat for himself of the fur he has taken perhaps on his own soil; an instance of despotism to which no parallel can be produced in the most arbitrary pages of British history."

Further, he wrote:

"Can any one reason be assigned why 160,000 electors in the island of Great Britain should give law to four million in the states of America, every individual of whom is equal to every individual of them, in virtue, in understanding, and in bodily strength? Were this to be admitted, instead of being a free people, as we have hitherto supposed and mean to continue ourselves, we should suddenly be found the slaves, not of one, but of one hundred and sixty thousand tyrants, distinguished too from all others by this singular circumstance, that they were removed from the reach of fear, the only restraining motive which may hold the hand of a tyrant."

Showing that Jefferson applied his democratic theories to the slaves, he declared:

"The abolition of domestic slavery is the great object of desire in those colonies, where it was unhappily introduced in their infant state. But previous to the enfranchisement [Note that Jefferson calls not only for the freedom, but the *enfranchisement* of the slaves—*F.F.*] of the slaves we have, it is necessary to exclude all further importations from Africa; yet our repeated attempts to effect this by prohibitions have been hitherto defeated by his majesty's negative: thus preferring the immediate advantages of a few African corsairs to the lasting interest of the American states, and to the rights of human nature, deeply wounded by this infamous practice."

Denouncing landed privileges, which he claims were forced on England only by the Norman Conquest, Jefferson angrily declared, "America

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was not conquered by William the Norman, nor its lands surrendered to him, or any of his successors."

Speaking proudly as an American, Jefferson wrote:

"These are our grievances, which we have thus laid before his majesty, with that freedom of language and sentiment which becomes a free people claiming their rights, as derived from the laws of nature, and not as the gift of their chief magistrate: let those flatter who fear; it is not an American art."

The First Continental Congress consisted of many debates over procedure. A Declaration of Rights was adopted, and a petition was sent to the King. After debate from the conservative Dickenson, this was couched in the most humble terms. Finally, a resolution for the non-importation and non-consumption of British goods was adopted.

In order to enforce these decisions, *Committees of Safety* were established in all the colonies. These developed into local organs of the Revolution.

On April 18, 1775, the war commenced. The patriots in Massachusetts received word that the British troops were to attempt to seize their military supplies in Concord that night. During the night, riders went throughout the countryside, informing the population to be ready and mobilizing the "minute men," sturdy farmers who had been training to be ready for action at a moment's notice. When the British began to proceed along the highway to Concord, they found themselves under fire from patriots in ambush. Behind every tree was a sniping "minute man." There followed the battles of Lexington and Concord. The war was on.

However, it was a war of rebellion. Not until after a year did it become a war for independence. Even leaders such as Washington were not then ready for complete separation from England. The real revolutionists used the utmost tact and diplomacy, and made no effort to force slogans upon the masses for which they were not then ready to fight. They united the masses around the slogans for which they *were* ready. And in the process of the war, the patriots learned from their experience that they must go all the way and fight for complete severance from the British Crown.

The writing of Thomas Paine helped to crystallize the growing sentiment for independence. His *Common Sense* came like an electric shock to the colonists. For six months before the signing of the Declaration of Independence, it was read throughout the entire country.

Paine declared:

"Volumes have been written on the struggle between England and America . . . but the period of debate is closed. Arms as the last resource decide the contest, the appeal was the choice of the King, and this Continent has accepted the challenge. . . .

"The sun never shined on a cause of greater worth. 'Tis not the affair of a City, a Country, a Province or a Kingdom; but of a Continent—of at least one-eighth part of the habitable Globe. 'Tis not the concern of a day, a year, or an age; posterity are virtually involved in the contest . . . even to the end of time.

"We have boasted the protection of Great Britain. She did not protect us from *our enemies on our account,* but from *her enemies on her own account.* . . . America would have flourished as much, and probably much more had no European power taken any notice of her. . . . France and Spain never were nor perhaps ever will be our enemies as *Americans* but as our being the *subjects of Great Britain.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Britain is the parent country, say some. Then the more shame upon her conduct. . . . Europe and not England is the parent country of America. This new world hath been the asylum for the persecuted lovers of civil and religious liberty from *every part* of Europe. . . . We claim brotherhood with every European Christian. . . . Not one-third of the inhabitants, even of this province [Pennsylvania—*Ed.*] are of English descent. Wherefore, I reprobe the phrase of parent or mother country applied to England only as being false, selfish, narrow and ungenerous. . . ." *

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

On June 7, 1776, the resolution for independence was introduced into the Second Continental Congress by Richard Henry Lee of Virginia. At that time, some of the delegations were not ready for the decision, so the supporters of independence decided not to press for an immediate vote. A committee of five was appointed to draft a declaration of independence to be brought back to the Congress. This Committee consisted of Franklin, Adams, Sherman, and Livingston. Jefferson was made chairman and was asked to write the Declaration.

There could have been no more suitable person to draft this famous document than Thomas Jefferson, then thirty-three years of age. Jefferson's father was a sturdy independent farmer in the Piedmont section of Virginia, which was then the frontier, considerably removed from the big plantations of the Tidewater. From his father, Jefferson came naturally to his independent, democratic principles. As William E. Dodd declared in his *Statesmen of the Old South*:

"It is not difficult . . . to see how the great principles of Jefferson's life—absolute faith in democracy—came to him. He was the product of the first West in American history. Jefferson loved his backwoods neighbors, and he, in turn, was loved by them."

The young Jefferson was sent to William and Mary College, where he came in contact with the liberal and revolutionary thought of the period and where he could listen to the fiery speeches of Patrick Henry in the Virginia House of Burgesses in the adjoining town of Williamsburg. Shortly after completing his study of the law, Jefferson was sent to represent his county in the House of Burgesses. There he soon won the reputation of a radical. He introduced resolutions against slavery and landed privilege, and began to win the hatred of the planters around Williamsburg. He was ever in the thick of the fights with the royal governor. So intent was he in carrying out reforms in his own state that, after the passage of the Declaration of Independence, he left the Continental Congress to return to the Virginia House of Burgesses to continue the fight for the breaking up of the big estates and for a more equitable distribution of land. Like most Virginians, he was intensely devoted to his own state, even though an internationalist.

The modesty and simplicity of Jefferson were revealed by his utter contempt for all offices or positions of honor. In his epitaph, which he wrote himself, he never mentioned that he had been Governor of Virginia, Secretary of State, and President of the United States; but mentioned simply that he was author of the Declaration of Independence, author of the Vir-

* "Common Sense," *Thomas Paine, Selections From His Writings*, pp. 28-29, International Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ginia Statute of Religious Liberty, and Founder of the University of Virginia. Jefferson had the most intense faith in education, which he wanted to be scrupulously separated from the church. Concerning slavery, he wrote in his *Autobiography*:

"Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people (the slaves) are to be free."

He always spoke of the enslaved Negroes with the utmost respect, speaking of them, as we do today, as a people, and showing by his speech that he regarded them as equals. Learning from his own experience that their freedom and enfranchisement were not to be obtained in his own day, he looked to the young generation to take up the fight for their emancipation. His *Notes on Virginia* contained biting attacks on slavery. He was anxious to get this book into the hanks of the young men in the schools, writing:

"It is to them I look, to the rising generation, and not to the one now in power, for these great reformations."

The longest paragraph in Jefferson's original draft of the Declaration of Independence was a burning attack on the African slave traffic. The passage follows:

"He has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him, captivating and carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in their transportation thither. This piratical warfare, the opprobrium of *infidel* powers, is the warfare of the *Christian* King of Great Britain. Determined to keep open a market where *men* should be bought and sold, he has prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or to restrain this execrable commerce. And that this assemblage of horrors might want no fact of distinguished die, he is now exciting those very people to rise in arms among us, and to purchase that liberty of which he has deprived them, by murdering the people on whom he also obtruded them: thus paying off former crimes committed against the *liberties* of one people, with crimes which he urges them to commit against the *lives* of another."

This passage, however, was too strong for the rich planters, many of whom were themselves profiting from the African slave-traffic; and much to the disgust of Jefferson, it was deleted from the final text.

Jefferson's draft, after considerable discussion and some rephrasing, was adopted on July 2, 1776, and was finally signed by the delegates on July 4.

On July 8, it was first announced to the people. The citizens of Philadelphia were called together by the ringing of the Liberty Bell in Independence Hall. The Declaration was read to the joyous group by Colonel John Dixon. Immediately thereafter, the crowds rushed to the State House, tore down the king's coat of arms, and burned it. Bells rang and bonfires burned till midnight. Throughout the land, the Declaration was read everywhere. In New York, the crowds tore down the leaden statue of George III, and its lead was cast into bullets "to assimilate with the brains of the enemy."

When Earl Browder spoke recently at the University of Virginia, he was asked how he could compare the Bolsheviks, who killed the Tsar, to our American revolutionists. Browder's reply came readily: "It was a lucky

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thing for George III that he was on the other side of the ocean." These deeds of the American patriots show the truth of this remark.

The Declaration of Independence, together with the Bill of Rights, is the very heart of true Americanism. These documents form the *American Magna Charta.*

REPLY TO THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE BY BRITISH TORIES

Shortly after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, there appeared the official reply of the British throne, presented as though coming from a mere subject. This volume was entitled *An Answer to the Declaration of the American Congress* by Jonathan Lind.

It opened by declaring,

"Ill would it become the *dignity* of an insulted sovereign to descend to altercation with revolted subjects. That would be to recognize that equality and independence, to which subjects, persisting in revolt, cannot fail to pretend. . . .

"Easy as it were, and fit as it may be, to refute the calumnies contained in that audacious paper, it could not be expected that his Majesty or his Ministers should condescend to give it any answer."

The reply sought to answer each of the charges leveled by the Declaration against the king. In answer to the charge, "He has plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people," Jonathan Lind declared that the Americans could complain as easily of such "just punishments" as could the *pirate,* Captain Kidd.

"One difference there is," declared this reply, "between the present rebels and the ancient pirate: the latter did not adopt the *regal stile.* He did not talk of *our* seas, *our* coasts, *our* towns, and *our* people."

Indignant at the boldness of the Americans, he declared:

"Had an Angel descended from Heaven with terms of accommodation, which offered less than independence, they would have driven him back with hostile scorn."

After dealing with the particular charges, this spokesman of George III turned to the preamble:

"In this preamble however it is that they attempt to establish a *theory of government;* a theory, as absurd and visionary, as the system of conduct in defense of which it is established, is nefarious. Here it is, that maxims are advanced in justification of their enterprises against the British government. To these maxims, adduced for *this purpose,* it would be sufficient to say, that they are *repugnant to the British Constitution.* But beyond this they are subversive of every actual or imaginable kind of government.

"They perceive not, or will not seem to perceive, that nothing which can be called government ever was, or ever could be, in any instance, exercised, but at the expense of one or other of those rights. . . .[*i.e.,* of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.]

"That men who are engaged in the design of subverting a lawful government should endeavor by a cloud of words, to throw a veil over their design; that they should endeavor to beat down the criteria between tyranny and lawful government is not at all surprising."

He proceeds to ask how the Americans can invade Canada, how they can deprive the Tories of life and liberty and force them to flee from their homes:

"In these tenets they have outdone the utmost extravagance of all former fanatics. The German Anabaptists indeed went so far as to speak of the right of enjoying life as a right unalienable. To take away life, even in the Magistrate, they held to be unlawful. But they went no further, it was reserved

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for an American Congress, to add to the number of unalienable rights, that of enjoying liberty and pursuing happiness."

Were subjects to be allowed to pursue *any* kind of happiness, asked Lind. Were penal codes contrary to the laws of God and the unalienable rights of man? Were thieves, murderers, rebels not to be restrained?

TASKS OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE LEFT UNFULFILLED BY THE REVOLUTION

Even after the end of the war, the fight for the principles of the Declaration of Independence was by no means over. For many years, the "economic royalists" of that day under the Hamiltonian Federalists sought to subvert democracy in the broad terms in which it was conceived by Jefferson. The majority of the framers of the Constitution were not revolutionary Democrats of the type of Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and Samuel Adams. Jefferson heartily approved of the Constitution, as framed, with its guarantee of representative government, but was greatly disturbed by the absence of a Bill of Rights. He helped organize the demand for the inclusion of such democratic guarantees through the first ten amendments.

Throughout the rest of his life, he devoted himself to the defense of the principles of this Magna Charta of American democracy. In opposition to the counter-revolutionary Federalists, he founded the Democratic Party as a party of small farmers and all the oppressed. He clamored for extension of the right to vote, for absolute freedom of speech, press, and assembly, for universal education. He realized that democracy was of little value without economic security. Thus he fought for land for the small farmers, for breaking up of the big estates. He secured the repeal of the laws of entail and primogeniture, which prevented this. Through the Louisiana Purchase, he secured vast tracts of land for distribution to homesteaders.

The battles for free or cheap land, for universal suffrage, for free public education, for security for the poor, were continued after Jefferson by the rugged Tennessee farmer, Andrew Jackson.

Subsequently, when the wealthy planters of the South had captured the Democratic Party, which they had hated so bitterly, the new Republican Party of Abraham Lincoln took up the fight for Jeffersonian democracy. Lincoln declared that since Jefferson's party had betrayed the principles of Jefferson, it became necessary for a new party to continue his fight. The early Republican Party first put into practice Jefferson's program for the abolition of slavery.

The task of securing freedom and equality for all Americans was nowhere more flagrantly denied than by the continuance of slavery, as Jefferson fully realized. It remained for four years of bloody Civil War to wipe out this stain upon American democracy. The enactment of the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments to the Constitution further applied the principles of the Declaration of Independence and further extended the Bill of Rights.

"THE EARTH BELONGS TO THE LIVING GENERATION"

New times and conditions impose new tasks upon the battle for democ-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

racy. Jefferson, who fully realized this, wrote:

> "No society can make a perpetual constitution or even a perpetual law. The earth belongs to the living generation."

The question of land as an economic base for democracy is just as burning today as it was in the time of Jefferson for the vast farm population of our country. The enormous growth of farm tenancy has made it even more burning. The recommendations of the President's Committee on Farm Tenancy have begun to tackle this problem in true Jeffersonian style. However, since Jefferson's day, the development of capitalism has brought about a thoroughgoing industrial revolution in our country. America is now predominantly industrial. The majority of our people no longer live in the country. Capitalism has reached its peak and fallen into general crisis. The last economic crisis gave way to chronic depression, and now a new crisis has commenced before we have fully recovered from the latter. The most burning problems of our era are, therefore, industrial problems. Obtaining economic security for the millions of industrial workers in our country is a prime necessity for giving a base to democracy.

The unprecedented growth of the labor movement since the full force of the crisis of 1929-33 fell upon us has resulted in new gains for labor, and these are at the same time new gains for democracy. The right of labor to organize and bargain collectively through the union of its own choice, as officially recognized in the Wagner Labor Relations Act, and the establishment of the National Labor Relations Board as a means of enforcing this right mean that, in our day, labor is, by growing strength and unity, actualizing significant aspects of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, applying those fundamental principles of American democracy to the new conditions of our own day.

Under the influence of labor, the progressive wing in the Democratic Party has now advanced a broad legislative program which would considerably supplement labor's recent achievements. This program, some of which has begun to be enacted into law, stands for social security legislation, minimum wages and maximum hours, price stabilization, tax reform to remove the burden from the poor, abolition of farm tenancy, regional planning such as the T.V.A., soil conservation, judicial reform, educational reform, recovery through work-relief projects, etc.

Against this program, the "sixty families," who play the same role as that played by the "160,000 British tyrants" in Jefferson's day, are girding for battle. In the very name of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, Big Business is today undermining the principles of these American documents by seeking to curb labor's civil liberty to organize, by seeking to discredit Roosevelt and organized labor through intensification of the new economic crisis, by conniving with foreign fascist powers, and seeking a way to establish Big Business fascism in America.

The "sixty families" are not only working through the Republican Party. They are also seeking to utilize the reactionary Democrats as a means

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of preventing the Democratic Party from becoming a party of progress. That is why the present Democratic primaries are so important.

Similarly, the reactionaries hope to confuse the issue through such movements as that of the LaFollette National Progressive Party, whose willfully vague program says nothing about the burning problems of the day, but which contains an *attack* upon the one burning need of Roosevelt's Recovery Program, and which thus coincides with the program of the fascist-minded reactionaries.

The growth of the democratic front today continues the battles of Jefferson and his followers for freedom and equality and for the rights of man. Through the legislative program, outlined above, it seeks to apply the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights to America of the twentieth century with its huge industrialization and dominance by sixty families of monopolist finance capitalists.

These struggles today are worldwide even as were the struggle of 1776. Spain's present efforts to maintain its republic are meeting with the furious resistance of the fascists as did the American Republic at the hands of the "fascists" of 1776, as Roosevelt recently called the supporters of George III. *Americans, however, must hang their heads in shame that, while monarchist France came to the aid of our young republic, democratic America has so far failed to come to the aid of the young Spanish republic.*

Against such isolationism as that through which the modern fascist-minded reactionaries hope to aid their worldwide assaults on democracy, Jefferson was most outspoken, as indicated by his unqualified support to the young French republic when it was under attack from all the feudal powers of old Europe.

Throughout the world, the independence of the small, "backward," or democratic nations is being threatened. Ancient China is fighting a war for independence as we did in 1776, although on a far vaster scale. Ethiopia in Africa has not given up the fight for freedom. Austria is now confronted with the same task. Czechoslovakia must defend herself from the fate of Austria. In all these assaults upon democracy by the modern monster of fascism the British Tories under Chamberlain are playing the same reactionary role which they played under George III. Schooled in methods of colonial oppression throughout centuries of rule, they are aiding and abetting the new menace of fascism in every possible way.

The crying need of the hour is for all who have faith in democracy to unite in a solid worldwide coalition of all democratic forces to prevent the fascist finance capitalists of the world from destroying the fruits of whole centuries of popular struggles for democratic rights.

Meanwhile, the growth under the new Stalinist Constitution of the Soviet Union of a democracy hitherto unequalled in the history of mankind has indicated that, under modern conditions, only socialism can afford an economic base capable of giving permanent support to the funda-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mental principles of Americanism as contained in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights.

Just as in Jefferson's day all those who were ready for struggle against British tyranny were not ready all at once to go the full length of the struggle for independence, so today all those who are ready to struggle for democracy have not yet drawn the logical conclusion that they can win their goal completely only through socialism. Just as in Jefferson's day the struggle for immediate reforms strengthened and consolidated the American forces and helped pave the way for the fight for complete independence, so today the building of the democratic front will unite and consolidate the American people and will pave the way for the achievement of complete democracy through the establishment of socialism.

We celebrate July Fourth, for on that day a challenge was hurled at international tyranny; a challenge which was given scientific precision by the greatest teachers of democracy of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries: Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. Fortified with their teachings and applying them to the present conditions of American life, the Communist Party, under the leadership of Earl Browder, sets itself the aim of giving body and form to the principles of the July Fourth Declaration in the America of today.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BUKHARIN—THE PATH OF A TRAITOR

BY V. J. JEROME

[*The first part of this article appeared in the June number of* The Communist. *It is concluded in this issue.*]

Bukharin fought the Leninist-Stalinist teachings and policy on the national question.

BUKHARIN together with Pyatakov published a thesis in 1915 in which they proved themselves at variance with the basic tenets of Leninism in regard to the national question.

In keeping with its general policy of surrendering the struggle for democracy in the epoch of imperialism, the Bukharin group rejected the principle of the right of nations to self-determination, maintaining that this principle was not realizable under capitalism, while under socialism it was superfluous. Thereby, the Bukharinites set themselves against the liberation movement of the oppressed nations and colonies, and manifested again their denial of the very principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which cannot be established, and of the victory of socialism, which cannot be achieved, save on the premise of the right of nations to self-determination.

Shortly afterwards Lenin took sharp issue with Bukharin:

"On the question of self-determination he presents us with the *same kind* of rubbish. . . .

"The question is important. It is a vital question. It is linked inseparably with the question of *annexations*: one of the most burning questions of the day." (Letter to A. G. Shlyapnikov, Zurich, March, 1916.)*

In April, 1916, Lenin published his theses, "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination" ** directed at the anti-Marxist position on the national question adopted by Bukharin and Pyatakov as well as the Polish Section of the Left Zimmerwaldists, headed by Karl Radek. In these theses, Lenin refuted the opposition to the right of nations to self-determination, showing that such opposition meant capitulation to the propaganda of the oppressing bourgeoisie for holding weaker nations in subjection. As to the realizability of self-determination under capitalism, he pointed to the secession of Norway from Sweden in 1905 and indicated the eventuation of Poland's independence. While as to its "superfluity" under socialism, he demonstrated that the complete democracy which the socialist society sets itself to achieve must therefore, "not only

* *The Letters of Lenin*, translated and edited by Elizabeth Hill and Doris Mudie. Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York.

** Printed in *Vorbote* (The Herald), the theoretical organ of the Zimmerwald Left, Issue No. 2.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bring about the complete equality of nations, but also give effect to the right of oppressed nations to self-determination, *i.e.*, the right to free political secession."

His trenchant words cut at the core of the anti-Marxism of Radek-Bukharin-Pyatakov:

"Socialist Parties which fail to prove by all their activities now, as well as during the revolution and after its victory that they will free the enslaved nations and establish relations with them on the basis of a free union —and a free union is a lying phrase without right to secession—such parties are committing treachery to Socialism." (Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. V, p. 267, International Publishers, New York.)

Bukharin and Pyatakov set themselves against Lenin and Stalin at the Eighth Party Congress (March, 1919), also on the national question. In this, they proceeded from the basic identity of their position with that of Trotsky in attempting to cut off the proletariat from its natural and historical allies and reserves, and to thwart the exercise of its role of hegemony. This position gave definite aid to the nationalist forces of counter-revolution. In declaring, at the Eighth Congress, that the right of nations to self-determination was in contradiction to the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat, that he was for "self-determination of the toilers," Bukharin was characteristically flourishing phrases of revolution in the interests of counter-revolution.

Comrade Stalin, who, together with Lenin, fought at the Eighth Congress for the decisive defeat of Bukharin's disastrous policy, later wrote:

"The Russian revolution would not have been victorious, Kolchak and Denikin would not have been defeated, unless the Russian proletariat had had the sympathy and support of the oppressed peoples throughout the area which was formerly the Russian empire. But to secure their sympathy and support, the Russian proletariat had, first of all, to break the chains that had been imposed on these peoples by Russian imperialism, to free them from the tsarist yoke. Otherwise it would have been impossible to consolidate the Soviet power, to inculcate true internationalism, to create that remarkable organization for the collaboration of the peoples which is known as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and is the forerunner of the coming union of the nations to form a world-wide economy." (*Leninism*, Vol. I, p. 142.)

Bukharin conducted his struggle against Lenin, Stalin, and the Central Committee by means of unprincipled anti-Party factionalism, subversion, and splitting tactics.

Very early, during the World War, Lenin had characterized Bukharin as "devilishly unstable in politics." (*Letter to Shlyapnikov*, cited place.)

At the 1915 conference of the foreign section of the R.S.D.L.P. (Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party) Bukharin, with his "Boggi group" (named after a town in Switzerland), endeavored to set up an "independent" center, against Lenin.

Bukharin and Pyatakov further showed their baseness by the fact that they sought to use their control of the Party's financial resources and the means, therefore, of subsidizing its official organ, as a whip-hand to demand of Lenin that he publish all articles setting forth the anti-Party views of their grouping. Excoriating their unprincipled conduct, Lenin wrote: "This is not discussion but the depth of intrigue and baseness." (*Collected Works*, Vol. XXIX, p. 239, Russian edition.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Their factional control of the Moscow Regional Party Bureau and the Moscow and Petrograd Party Committees, and the anti-Party struggle which they waged against Lenin and Stalin in regard to the Brest-Litovsk peace negotiations have already been referred to.

Steadily, the influence of "Left Communists" waned, until it practically disappeared from the Party ranks. In the middle of May, 1918, the Moscow Regional Conference adopted Lenin's theses *On the Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government,* thus ending the control of the "Left" factionalists. The Urals Regional Committee likewise went over to the side of Lenin and Leninism. Bukharin and Co. continued their opposition, threatening a split, unless a special congress of the Party would be convened. Some months later they admitted their guilt and (outwardly) liquidated their faction—with what sincerity time later showed.

This step was taken only to deceive the Party and the masses; for we now know that these confessions and the "dissolution" of the faction were undertaken only as a cover for carrying on illegal work. It was at this time that they planned, together with the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries and Trotsky, to arrest and kill Lenin, Stalin, and Sverdlov, and to install their own government with Pyatakov at the head.

As the trial of Bukharin has shown, they knew and approved of—in fact, were to a great extent responsible for—the attempt to kill Lenin by Dora Kaplan, Left Socialist-Revolutionary, who inflicted the bullet wound that shortened his life.

In the ensuing years, many of the "Left Communists" identified themselves with new opposition factions, particularly Sapranov's Group of "Democratic Centralism" of 1920-21 and the Trotskyite opposition of 1923-24 and 1926-28, finally landing in the camp of counter revolution and fascism.

Bukharin fought Lenin and Stalin on the trade union question.

In 1920-21, Bukharin again came forward with an opportunistic program in opposition to Lenin and Stalin, this time on the trade union question. This opposition, launched by Trotsky, brought discord into the Party at a time when all its forces were needed to cope with the difficult conditions at the beginning of 1921.

The transition from the period of War Communism to the stage of the N.E.P. and Reconstruction demanded that the trade unions come vitally into play as a factor in schooling the masses and drawing them into the work of building socialism. To this end, Lenin and Stalin, realizing the imperative necessity of the N.E.P. as the means of initiating the economic reconstruction of the Soviet Republic, as the stage from which to advance to socialist construction, stressed the need for instituting in the trade unions workers' democracy and education; for bringing the trade unions to concern themselves with the cultural and social, as well as the economic, advance of the working masses; for realizing in all its fullness Marx's conception of trade unions as a school of socialism.

Against this program of the Party, Trotsky advanced his own platform.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not democracy, but intensified compulsion in the trade unions. Not concern with the economic, cultural and social interests of the millions of workers, with schooling the masses for socialism — this is an affair of the state alone. (Note how the opposition of Trotskyism to the victory of socialism is here reflected!) The trade unions, Trotsky contended, would have to become state organs, with their main function the direct administration of economy. "Nationalization of the trade unions!" was the central slogan that Trotsky advanced in that struggle against the Party—the proposal to coalesce the trade unions with the state: in other words, an inverted form of syndicalism. (Let it be borne in mind that in seeking to transfer the administration of industry from the proletarian state to the trade unions, Trotsky hoped thereby to deny any governmental participation to the peasantry, whose revolutionary alliance with the proletariat, and the dictatorship of the proletariat based on that alliance, he had set himself to destroy—however devious and foul the means.*)

Bukharin, with Serebryakov and Preobrazhensky, organized the "buffer group," ostensibly a group to conciliate between the Central Committee and Trotsky; but in actuality Bukharin served only as an ally of Trotsky and an opponent of Lenin.

Lenin roundly condemned this buffer group:

". . . the theses of Bukharin & Co. are the acme of *idcological disintegration*. . . . This is a complete rupture with communism and a transition to the position of syndicalism." (*Selected Works*, Vol. IX, p. 35.)

With Bolshevik foresight Lenin warned:

"The more Comrade Bukharin defends his deviation from communism, which is obviously wrong theoretically and deceptive politically, the more deplorable will be the fruits of his obstinacy." (*Ibid.*, p. 79.)

Lenin pointed out that Bukharin's position meant an essential repetition of Shlyapnikov's slogan "Unionize the state"; it meant transferring the apparatus of the Supreme Council of National Economy to the corresponding trade unions; it means annulling the Marxian conception of the trade unions as schools of Communism and concentrating in the hands of the trade unions the entire management of the national economy; it thus denied the guiding role of the Party and the historic tasks of the proletarian state. (This follows logically from Bukharin's anarchistic position on the state.) Lenin, therefore, condemned Bukharin's stand as being anti-Communist and Anarcho-Syndicalist.

Lenin stated in this connection:

"The political errors committed by Comrade Trotsky, and aggravated, made more profound, by Comrade Bukharin, *distract* our Party from economic problems, from 'production' work, and unfortunately *compel us to waste time* on rectifying these errors, on arguing against the syndicalist deviation (which leads to the fall of the dictatorship of the proletariat), on arguing against a wrong approach to the trade union movement (an approach which leads to the downfall of the Soviet government), on arguing about general 'theses,' instead of engaging in businesslike, practical 'economic' argument. . . ." (*Ibid.*, p. 57.)

* Note the resemblance of Trotsky's trade union program with Mussolini's corporative unions and Hitler's *Gleichschaltung*.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bukharin fought the Party's program for socialist construction.

Proceeding from his position in regard to "organized capitalism" and his essential denial of the general crisis of capitalism, Bukharin exaggerated the relative and partial stabilization of capitalism (1923-29). Denying the possibility of building socialism in the U.S.S.R. and being fundamentally opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat, denying also the revolutionary capacities of the peasantry, he set himself against the program of industrialization and farm collectivization—against the path of advance to socialism. At a time when the proletariat had to strengthen its alliance with the middle peasantry for intensifying the struggle against the kulak class, Bukharin, holding, against Leninism, that after the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the class struggle dies down, issued, in 1925, the notorious slogan to the kulaks, "Enrich yourselves!" Thereby he grouped the kulaks together with the poor and middle peasantry, rejecting the Party's historically imperative policy of decisively defeating the kulak resistance to the building of socialism.

Ostensibly Bukharin's slogan was addressed to the whole peasantry. But at a time when, with the exception of very few experimental communal and collective farms, agriculture was carried on on the basis of individual holdings, this slogan expressed the kulak interests and encouraged their resistance to the proletarian policy of restricting the kulaks through measures of state regulation, taxation and limitation of free trade. Bukharin was immediately called to order by the Party and was compelled to repudiate the slogan. But it indicated Bukharin's conception—which later found open expression in the opposition of the Rights to the socialist program of industrialization and collectivization—as that of the development of Soviet economy along capitalist lines.

During the period of socialist reconstruction Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky and Uglanov again set themselves in opposition to the Party line.

This grouping, in the period of socialist reconstruction, dropped its earlier "Left" phrases and operated as a Right camp, entering into a struggle against the central resolutions adopted by the Communist Party at its Fifteenth Congress, in December, 1927. At this Congress, Comrade Stalin advanced as the historic task confronting the Communist Party and the Soviet people:

> "To expand and strengthen our socialist commanding heights in all branches of national economy in city and village, maintaining the course of liquidation of capitalist elements in the national economy."

Resolved to overcome completely the resistance of class enemies in this period of the sharpening of the class conflict, the Party and the Soviet masses now launched the decisive struggle for the attainment of socialism. The Right opposition thereupon began a new series of attacks, which they continued unceasingly, against the Leninist Central Committee, now under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, the closest co-worker of Lenin during his lifetime, and his best disciple.

In the autumn of 1928, Bukharin came out with an attack upon industrialization, voicing his slogan of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sabotage: "Out of the bricks of the future you cannot build factories now." At a time when the Soviet government was setting out to eradicate the very roots of capitalism in the land, the Right opportunists, headed by Bukharin, Tomsky and Rykov—three members of the Central Committee—set themselves against the program of industrialization (ostensibly on the issue of "tempo"), against the development of collective farms; and came forward with defenses of the kulaks (contentions that the kulaks really were poor peasants), opposing the government's emergency measures for grain collections, opposing the general line for creating a socialist economy, for the socialist transformation of agriculture, for the victory of socialism over kulakism. In this, Bukharin, as the "ideological head" of the Right deviation, was translating into life his "theory" (deriving from his mechanistic materialism) of the termination of the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat, with the corollary that the kulak would grow into socialism.

In the words of Comrade Stalin:

"The abolition of classes *by means of the bitter class struggle of the proletariat*—such is Lenin's formula.

"The abolition of classes *by means of the dying down of the class struggle and the capitalists growing into socialism*—such is Comrade Bukharin's formula." (*Leninism*, Vol. II, p. 124.)

Bukharin and Co., hence, became spokesmen and agents of kulakism; they aided and abetted the counter-revolutionary circle of kulakist apologists, headed by Kondratiev and Chayanov; the slogans of the Right opportunist camp were taken up by the counter-revolutionary wreckers of the Industrial Party (Ramzin and Co.).

In October, 1928, the Plenum of the Moscow Committee of the Party, by a decisive majority, defeated and routed the Right-opportunist anti-Leninist forces represented of late by the Secretary of the Committee, Uglanov, who had the backing of Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky. In place of Uglanov, Comrade Molotov was then chosen as Secretary of the Moscow Committee.

At that Plenum, which completed the ideological shattering of the Right opportunist line, Comrade Stalin declared:

"There cannot be the slightest doubt that the triumph of the Right deviation in our Party would release the forces of capitalism, would undermine the revolutionary position of the proletariat, and increase the chances for the restoration of capitalism in our country." (*Leninism*, Vol. II, p. 145.)

Early in 1929, it was discovered that Bukharin had been instructed by the Right Center, through Sokolnikov, to carry on secret negotiations with Kamenev who, after admission of his errors, had recently been readmitted into the Communist Party. Kamenev and Bukharin had discussed the formation of a bloc for intensified struggle against the Central Committee and the Five-Year Plan of socialist construction.

It thus became apparent that the Rights were prepared to form a bloc with the Trotskyites, that in their struggle against the Party they were prepared to coalesce with the Trotskyites.

The Rights leveled against the Five-Year Plan accusations of "mili-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tary-feudal exploitation of the peasantry."* They proposed to substitute importation of wheat from abroad for grain collections from the kulaks (coupled with diminished investment in industry). In place of collective and Soviet farms, they proposed the development of the individual sector of agriculture. Under the demagogic slogan of "normalizing the market," they proposed to base the entire economic policy on free trade. They proposed, in short, a policy of retreat to capitalism.

In regard to the capitalist world, Bukharin, Rykov and their camp denied all perspectives of revolution or revolutionary struggle. Proceeding basically from the theory of "organized capitalism," they magnified greatly the temporary and partial stabilization of capitalism. Bukharin became the rallying point of all the opportunist elements in the Comintern—the Brandler-Thalheimer camp in Germany, the Lovestoneites in the U.S.A.,** the Kilboom group in Sweden, Jilek and Co. in Czechoslovakia.

In a special resolution, the April, 1929, Plenum of the Central Committee condemned the Right opportunist factional activity of Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky. In July of that year Bukharin was removed from the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. In November he was removed from the Political Bureau.

The aid and comfort that the Right opportunists rendered to the camp of counter-revolution, and the very capitalist-restorationist character of the Bukharin-Rykov platform were thus attested to by Ramzin at the trial of the leaders of the counter-revolutionary Industrial Party,* in November, 1930:

"The basic method of sabotage was the artificial decrease of tempo in the development of the national economy. This line coincided with the position of the Right deviation in the Communist Party, and explained why the carrying through of artificially lowered minima plans through the State Planning organs, created an original bloc in the Center with the Right Communists, which greatly helped the Center to confirm similar plans."

And now we have from Kerensky's own mouth (speech delivered at Carnegie Hall, New York, April 9, 1938), the admission that the traitors —Bukharin, Kamenev, and Zinoviev, were carrying on negotiations with him through emissaries in 1927. He told that a proposal for cooperation with these three counter-revolutionaries had been laid before him in Paris as early as 1927 with a plan to work together for the overthrow of the Soviets:

"We [Kerensky admitted] were ready to accept the proposition and cooperate with Bukharin, Zinoviev and Kamenev. To our misfortune, Stalin interfered, and all our

* Bukharin testified at the trial: "Yet I myself in 1928 invented the formula about the military-feudal exploitation of the peasantry, that is, I put the blame for the costs of the class struggle, not on the class which was hostile to the proletariat, but on the leaders of the proletariat itself." (*Report of Court Proceedings in the Case of the Anti-Soviet "Bloc of Rights and Trotskyites,"* Moscow, 1938, English edition, p. 381.

** Who does not remember Lovestone's smug saying: "Bukharin is good enough for me"?

* The Industrial Party, a counter-revolutionary organization which united all the separate sabotage groups of various branches of industry into one organization. It acted on the instructions of the international organizations of former Russian, as well as foreign, capitalists, with regard to wrecking activities and the overthrow of Soviet power through armed intervention. Ramzin, a professor at the Moscow Technical College, was one of the chief conspirators, brought to trial in November, 1930.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plans were wiped out." (*Daily Worker*, April 12, 1938.)

From unprincipled opposition to counter-revolution and fascism.

In 1928-29, the Rights organized surreptitious conferences and set up an illegal center.

The launching of the Five-Year Plan saw a great intensification of the class struggle. The kulaks met the program of the Party with sabotage, hoping with resistance to halt the policy of collectivization. Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky aided their efforts through their illegal counter-revolutionary organization. Bukharin, in his testimony at the trial, stated:

"The inception of the idea of the *coup d'etat* among us Right conspirators relates approximately to the years 1929-30. . . . At that period we were already discussing the question of the overthrow of the Soviet government by force, with the aid of a group of military participants in the plot. . . .

"In 1931-32, in connection with the changed political situation, the main stress was laid on the development of the insurrectionary movement, and the counter-revolutionary Right organization, headed by the center of the Rights, provoked several kulak revolts. . . ." (*Report of Court Proceedings*, pp. 394, 395-6.)

The year 1932 brought the successful completion of the first Five-Year Plan in four years. Capitalist stabilization had ended, and world capitalism was in crisis; the masses in all lands were following the road of open struggle. Against the dark clouds of capitalist crisis, shone the sun of victorious socialist construction in the U.S.S.R.; and the authority of communism grew among the masses in all lands. History confirmed the correctness of the Leninist-Stalinist policy and revealed the miserableness of the various camps of opposition to communism.

The Right counter-revolutionary center (Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky, Uglanov, Yenukidze) took the step from which there was no return. Bukharin related in his testimony:

"About the autumn of 1932 the next stage in the development of the Right organization began, namely the transition to tactics of a forcible overthrow of Soviet power. . . .

"Proceeding to the tactics of forcible overthrow in general, I make note of the time when the so-called Ryutin platform was formulated. . . . It was called the Ryutin platform for reasons of secrecy, as an insurance against exposure; it was called the Ryutin platform in order to conceal the Right center and its top leadership. . . .

"At the end of 1932 the bloc of Rights, Trotskyites and Zinovievites was formed on the basis of the Ryutin platform. By that time terrorist sentiments had already begun to develop among the participants of the counter-revolutionary organization of the Rights. They were to be marked among my so-called disciples, in the Matveyev group surrounding Uglanov, among Rykov's supporters and among certain trade union functionaries, as was at one time disclosed in the press. The formation of the group of conspirators in the Red Army relates to that period." (*Ibid.*, pp. 388, 393.)

The Ryutin program, accordingly, showed the bloc of Rights and Trotskyites as one conspirative camp for the destruction of the Soviet power. There were: Ryutin himself, a Right opportunist during 1928-30, expelled from the C.P.S.U.; the remnants of the old "Workers' Opposition," headed by Shlyapnikov; the closest pupils of Bukharin—Slepkov, Maretsky, Petrovsky; and active collaborators within the Trotskyite counter-revolutionary organization. The lead-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ers were Bukharin, Tomsky, Rykov, on the one hand, and Zinoviev and Kamenev, on the other—with Trotsky as the "guiding genius."

In 1932, the Presidium of the Central Committee exposed the Ryutin group as trying to create a kulak organization with the design of restoring capitalism in the U.S.S.R. The resistance of the kulaks to socialization was reflected in the Ryutin program.

Another counter-revolutionary underground organization was the Eismont-Tolmachev group, a branch of the counter-revolutionary organization of the Rights, discovered in 1932. The Rights had resorted to terrorism. Rykov, Tomsky, and Schmidt were caught having relations with the Eismont group and others. Again these "leaders" tried to deceive the Party, denying their crimes, trying to cover up the traces of their criminal activities and underground links, by "confessions" of error.

At the trial Bukharin testified:

"I sent Slepkov to prepare a kulak revolt in the Kuban. Rykov sent Eismont to the Caucasus, and he entered into connections with the Right-winger Pivovarov and the Trotskyite Beloborodov; . . . In addition . . . I was informed by P. Petrovsky and Zaitsev of kulak sabotage as a sort of preliminary stage preceding sharper forms of struggle." (*Ibid.*, p. 396.)

But the steady march of the Soviet millions building socialism spelled doom for the plans of Bukharin and his "pals." Their real support could no longer be the kulaks, now liquidated. They had to rely for aid with increasing feverishness upon the spearhead of the anti-Soviet forces abroad—*fascism*. Their hope for the restoration of capitalism on Soviet soil threw them into active collusion with the would-be invaders of Soviet territory for the dismemberment of the Soviet Union.

Bukharin and Rykov at the trial took responsibility for Karakhan's secret negotiations with Nazi German circles. Rykov stated:

"The characteristic thing is that Karakhan reported that the German fascists were, of course, very well disposed towards the prospects of the Rights coming into power and would welcome it very much. . . . He said that the Germans insisted on the national republics receiving the right freely to secede from the Union." (*Ibid.*, p. 179.)

The trial has definitely established that, acting under the direct orders of Trotsky, Bukharin and Rykov, the members of the bloc of Rights and Trotskyites were engaged in espionage against the U.S.S.R. in accordance with plans worked out in the General Staffs of Japan, Germany, Great Britain, and Poland. Trotsky is the arch-enemy of the Soviet people, and has been exposed as having conducted espionage for the Foreign Intelligence Service of Germany since 1921 and for the British Intelligence Service since 1926.

The anti-Soviet bloc of Rights and Trotskyites planned and carried through the assassination of Kirov; they planned attempts upon the lives of leaders of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet government. With the help of corrupt physicians blackmailed by the fiendish Yagoda they put to death Kuibyshev, Chairman of the Supreme Council; Menzhinsky, People's Commissar for the Interior; and the world-beloved literary genius, Maxim Gorky, intimate of Lenin and Stalin,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

loyal adherent of the Communist Party.

The Trotsky-Bukharin gang promised their imperialist allies to work from within as the "Fifth Column" and by the "opening of the front" bring about the defeat of the Red Army. To this end they worked, as revealed in the testimony, in collusion with Tukhachevsky, Yakir and the other traitor generals. To this end they promised to secure the dismemberment of the Soviet Union and prepared for this dismemberment with bourgeois-nationalists in a number of Soviet republics.

The bloc of the Rights and Trotskyites set itself the task of restoring capitalism in the Soviet Union through the military intervention of fascist armies.

The Soviet court—and the judgment of all who hold dear the cause of socialism, of all who stand for peace, democracy, and human advancement—have meted out to this traitorous band the full measure of proletarian justice.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROBLEMS OF BUILDING THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT

(From the Convention Discussion on Earl Browder's Report)

LESSONS OF THE POPULIST MOVEMENT IN THE SOUTH

BY ROBERT F. HALL

District Organizer, District 17 (in the South)

COMRADE FOSTER pointed out in an article in *The Communist* a year ago that we have People's Front traditions in the old Populist Party movement of the 1890's. This is certainly true of the South. The democratic front movement will be made stronger through an understanding and appreciation of these traditions.

The Populist movement was a movement of the common people against the crushing power of the railroads, banks and monopolies. It was primarily a movement of the small farmers, but it included such labor organizations as existed in the South at that time. It achieved, in a large measure, even though brief, a unity with the Negro people.

The Farmers Alliance, the organizational base of the Populist movement, began in the South, and by 1890 had three million members. In Georgia it had one hundred thousand members, and organization in 134 of her 137 counties. Twenty thousand delegates crowded into Atlanta from Southern states for one of its big gatherings. The movement was called a revolution. Certainly, it enlisted the burning spirit and enthusiasm of the Southern masses; it brought forward new forces, new leaders from the masses, all eager to take up the fight for the freedom of the common people from the strangling grip of the corporations.

The Populist movement showed that the unity of labor and the farmers is not an impossibility in the South. Today, when Father Coughlin and the fascists are making a desperate effort to drive a wedge between the C.I.O. and the farmers, it is well to remember that. The Alliance amended its Constitution to take in workers as members, and its St. Louis platform was a platform adopted in unity with the Knights of Labor.

Tom Watson, the leading Southern Populist, declared:

> "Our statute books are filled with legislation in behalf of capital, at the expense of labor. If we must have class legislation, we have always had it, what class is more entitled to it than the largest class, the working class?"

The unity of Negro and white which existed during the days of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Populism is still a subject for amazement among the bourgeois historians of today. Although the Farmers Alliance began as a strictly white organization, it soon became obvious that the white farmers needed the Negroes, and a parallel Alliance was organized in which a million and a quarter Negro sharecroppers, tenants and small owners were members. To the Negro and white farmers, the Populist movement said, in the words of Tom Watson:

"You are kept apart that you may be separately fleeced of your earnings. You are made to hate each other because upon that hatred is rested the arch of financial despotism which enslaves you both. You are deceived and blinded that you may not see how this race antagonism perpetuates a monetary system which beggars both."

The Populist movement was determined, he said, to make lynch law "odious to the people." In Georgia county two thousand armed white farmers swarmed into a town in 1892 to prevent the lynching of a young Negro Populist leader.

We need not go into the confusions of Populist economics here. I do wish, however, to examine some of the other reasons, more important at the time, for the failure of the Populist movement.

The most basic is the fact that the labor movement was not strong. In the South, the working class was only beginning, and organization hardly existed. But today we have a large working class and strong organizations in the South. We have a base for the building of a progressive people's movement which our fathers did not have. Let us keep clearly in our minds in the South that the constant building and strengthening of the labor movement, the building of the C.I.O. and achieving unity with the Railroad Brotherhoods and the A. F. of L. are our basic, day-to-day task.

But the Populist movement should awaken us, at the same time, to the need for more attention to organizing the small farmers in the South. We must think of farm organization, not in terms of two or three or five thousand farmers in a state, but of tens of thousands, and of hundreds of thousands and millions throughout the South. It is in this light that we must take up the problem of building the Farmers Union. We have seven and a half million people in our district, of whom five and a half million live in the rural districts. We have thirty million people in the South, of whom two-thirds, twenty-one million, are farmers who with their families are rural dwellers. A democratic front movement in the South cannot afford to overlook this.

In the South, especially, we must realize how inadequate has been the New Deal program insofar as it affects the small farmers, white and Negro. We must bring forward and popularize our program of amendments to the A.A.A., which will protect the interests of the small farmers. We must work on our program for amendments to the Bankhead-Jones Act to liberalize and democratize the Act to enable tenants and sharecroppers to secure the ownership of the land on which they toil. If we are to build a democratic front in the South, we must win the farmers, and we must teach the Southern trade union movement

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to this end. This is a basic lesson of Populism.

Another reason for the failure of the Populists was that, despite their desire for unity with the Negro people, despite the fact that they admitted Negroes as members, they did not make the fight for Negro rights the keystone of their program in the South. This should be a warning to those labor leaders in the South who think that it is enough to open their membership rolls to the Negro workers, that it is enough to fight for better wages and shorter hours for Negro workers as well as white workers.

The reactionaries split the Populist movement and destroyed the Alliance by two methods. They appealed to the Negro people with demagogy, exaggerating every incident in which a Populist leader or politician had failed in his duty to the Negro people. They pointed out that the organizational policy of the Alliance was a Jim-Crow policy. On the other hand, they waved the bloody shirt before the whites and raised the cry of Negro domination, the trick they had learned in Reconstruction days.

This was possible because the Populist leaders did not have a thorough understanding of the Negro question and because they did not educate their white membership to its importance.

No, comrades, it is not enough that the C.I.O. or the democratic front shall open its rolls to Negroes. It is not enough that the general economic demands of the Negroes shall be served along with those of the white workers or farmers. The fight for Negro rights must be made the keystone in the building of the democratic front in the South. We must demonstrate to the C.I.O. in the South, to the Farmers Union, and to the progressives, that the fight against lynching, for the right to vote, the right to sit on juries, and all the civil rights of the Negro people must be a *day-to-day task*. It cannot be pushed into the background or ignored. Jim-Crow practices must be fought constantly, and we must teach this to the white workers and the leaders of the C.I.O.

Today, when fascist elements are engaged in disseminating pro-Japanese propaganda and anti-Semitism among the Negro people, we must not forget this important lesson from the history of Populism.

And let me utilize this example to urge that our Party, especially in the South, shall revive immediately the campaign for the enactment of the Anti-Lynching Bill. Ten days ago a young Negro was shot down in the corridor of the Birmingham court house, a crime committed with the connivance and aid of law enforcement authorities. Let us use this issue to build the Southern Negro Youth Congress, the N.A.A.C.P., and also to arouse the white workers in the unions to the need for solidarity with the Negro people.

The Democratic Party gobbled up the Populist movement by borrowing portions of its program and nominating the commoner William Jennings Bryan. In the South, it is essential that we concentrate on the election of progressives in the Democratic primaries, on a platform of progressive legislation. Our immediate program can be summarized as "Bring the New

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Deal to the South." But we must remember that reactionaries have capitalized on the inadequacies and shortcomings of the New Deal. They have been partially successful with the farmers. We must not forget the fact that the reactionary wing of the Democratic Party has been the controlling wing in the South for many years. Despite the large number of progressive victories in the South, accomplished through the Democratic primaries, let us not forget that the mass of Southern common people are far from contented with the Democratic Party. Which is as it should be. If we cannot show them in the immediate future that progressive action can be achieved through the Democratic primaries, they will turn elsewhere for relief.

That is why Governor Phil LaFollette considers the South a fertile field for the promotion of his third party. If he succeeded, that would be serious business in the South.

All of which requires that we as Communists, as the Communist Party, must make our own independent position completely clear to the people. In supporting progressives in the Democratic primaries, we must guard against being identified with the Democratic Party as such. We must demonstrate that the Democratic Party is not today a party in the old sense but a battleground on which progressives and reactionaries are fighting for control. Our own goal of a Farmer-Labor Party as the American expression of the People's Front must constantly be before us.

THE PROBLEM OF WINNING THE YOUTH FOR THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT

BY CARL ROSS

National Executive Secretary of the Young Communist League

I WISH to discuss the practical steps steps for the Party and Young Communist League in working through the existing broad progressive youth movement for winning the masses of youth for the democratic front. The great majority of young people in every state of the Union are already organized into, or directly influenced by, large mass organizations. Millions of these young people have been drawn into the stream of the progressive movement through the influx of young workers into the labor movement and particularly by the establishment of the American Youth Congress, the Southern Negro Youth Congress, and many other broad progressive youth movements. These developments create favorable conditions for winning large sections of youth for active participation in the democratic front, to defeat reaction in the 1938 elections.

What are these specially favorable conditions? First, the existence of a broad American youth movement involving close collaboration on a number of minimum issues between conscious supporters of a People's Front policy and broad masses of young people. The existence of such unity paves the way for entrance by ever larger sections of the movement into an active political struggle to defeat reaction.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Second, this unity of youth has been developing around *legislative measures,* such as support for the American Youth Act, the Wages and Hours Bill, the Anti-Lynching Bill, and, therefore, is tending to arouse and develop the political consciousness of the movement as a whole. The next logical step for the more mature sections is the support of progressive political platforms and candidates.

Third, the large mass organizations of young people like the Y's, which have taken a traditionally non-partisan and neutral position in relation to politics, are now experiencing a change in attitude. The great interest in politics now developing in organizations like the Y.M.C.A. and Christian youth groups indicates a trend among these youth which makes them huge potential reserves for the democratic front.

What is the program upon which the forces of the democratic front among the young people can be gathered? First and foremost, youth can be rallied to the democratic front around the slogan our Party has raised for "Jobs, Security, Democracy, and Peace." Concretely, this means mobilizing youth to support the election program that Comrade Browder has outlined, because all of these measures vitally concern the majority of youth whose problems can only be solved together with those of the people as a whole. We do not limit ourselves to a narrow conception that only so-called youth issues and youth candidates can win youth's support—for the young people are above all interested in these central problems of the whole people. At the same time, in addition to measures such as wages and hours legislation, measures to defend the rights of labor and to defeat the monopolies, a program of specific youth measures must also be devised by all progressive forces, and, therefore, by our Party.

Such a program is in the main embodied in the points of cooperation adopted by the American Youth Congress and in the specific youth measures proposed by Roosevelt. The specific youth points of such a program for the democratic front are:

A. The extension of the National Youth Administration as a permanent agency to provide jobs and education to the youth.

B. The extension of the C.C.C. program under a civilian administration with the inclusion of a democratic program of education and vocational training.

C. Coordination of National Youth Administration, C.C.C., and other youth aid programs under a single youth administration as proposed by the President's Advisory Committee on Education.

D. A program of federal aid to education as proposed in the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Education.

E. These efforts should be directed toward realizing the principles of the American Youth Act, which remains the most comprehensive and adequate measure of youth legislation.

F. To wipe out, once and for all, to declare unconstitutional, the shame of child labor in America.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These proposals have already met with the approval of the majority of youth and their organizations. They should be regarded as the specific points for solving the problems of youth through which the general program of the democratic front can be elaborated.

Our main objective is to gather together and organize the democratic front forces among the youth in the 1938 elections on the basis of such a program. We must help to unite all progressive youth behind a single progressive candidate for each elective office. Naturally, the forms for development of this movement will vary from state to state and from locality to locality in line with the specific electoral and political conditions.

However, I would like to discuss a number of the most concrete tasks of our Party among certain sections of the youth in connection with these coming elections. First, of course, our Party must concern itself with organizing the forces of the working class youth as the basis for the democratic front among the young people. The basis of a mass movement of working class youth exists among those hundreds of thousands of young people who have joined the trade unions in the recent period, especially through the C.I.O., in which these young people are receiving, not only trade union, but also political education. Special methods must be utilized for organizing these young people in the unions so that they can become an effective force within the democratic front. The Labor Sport Leagues which have recently developed in Cleveland, New York, Minnesota and other states, are giving organized expression to the youth within the trade unions. This should be extended to include an entire system of *education* and *cultural* activities throughout the trade union movement.

This activity in the unions should be our Party's and League's first responsibility among the working class youth. Unfortunately, some of our comrades in the Party are not yet thoroughly convinced that a Young Communist League must be built in every industry in order to perform this task. The building of a large Young Communist League, among the industrial youth is a prerequisite for developing a strong working class base and core within the whole youth movement. This is particularly true for such important regions where large numbers of youth are employed, in the steel, mining, auto, and marine industries.

Actually, more people are recruited into the Party from these industries than into the League. This, in itself, indicates the possibilities before our Party in helping to organize a Young Communist League among those young workers that will educate them for socialism and guide them in their trade union activities. A Young Communist League of this type in industry can grow even more rapidly than our Party, and can be a tremendous force in developing the progressive labor movement, and in drawing working class youth into the general youth movement.

The trade unions should also be convinced to pay special attention to the defense of the immediate interests of the young workers in industry. Youth have been more seriously affected by unemployment in the recent

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

months than any other section of the working people. Layoffs among the youth have been accentuated even further by the application of the principle of seniority rights in such industries as steel and auto. Reactionary anti-union elements are taking advantage of this situation by attempting to place the blame for unemployment among youth on the trade unions. This reactionary drive is intended to weaken the influence of trade unionism among the youth and to divide the older from the younger workers. It should be the first concern of our comrades in trade unions where there are large numbers of youth to meet this attempt on the part of reaction to weaken and destroy the unions.

Consolidation of the trade unions, and especially the maintenance of their influence over the youth, depend upon special attention to the needs of unemployed young workers. Trade unions must fight to secure for the young unemployed jobs on W.P.A. and public works, or relief. They should oppose all the discriminatory measures against youth such as state or local relief regulations which prevent single young workers from securing relief. They should popularize the Roosevelt recovery and jobs program and win the support of young workers to these measures. If the unions take up these economic needs of the youth and at the same time develop a widespread system of trade union education and activity, it will be possible to crystallize the definite progressive working class youth movement through the trade unions.

Second, our Party should carefully study possibilities for work among the organizations of farm youth in every state. The 1,000,000 members of the 4H clubs, the 400,000 members of the Future Farmers of America, and the large youth organizations developed around the Farmers Union, Grange, and Farm Bureau are a tremendous potential force for progress. Already the first steps have been taken in the direction of national cooperation between these powerful farm organizations. In a number of states some of these farm youth organizations have been involved in the American Youth Congress. Unity between these organizations of young farmers could have tremendous influence on bringing the entire organized farm movement into the democratic front. In many instances the development of unity between these large farm organizations around the youth problems can be the first steps to cooperation between the farm organizations and other progressive forces. Therefore, in the preparations for the coming elections, our Party should give special attention to bringing the farm youth into the progressive movement and particularly to strengthening the *Farmers Union Junior* organizations which already have approximately 15,000 members.

Third, our Party should recognize the increased possibilities of support among Negro youth for a democratic front. The Southern Negro Youth Congress has become the movement which best represents the democratic aspirations of the Negro young people of the South. Its recent conference, representing 385,000 Southern Negro youth, raises the issue that is of most vital concern to the Negro people—the question of *the right to vote*. The building of the Southern Negro

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Youth Congress would strengthen tremendously all of the forces of the democratic front among the Negro people of the South and help to defeat the Southern Tories. A similar growth of progressive Negro youth movements in other parts of the country indicates the growing determination of Negro young people to gain better living conditions and equal rights.

Further, our Party must help to mobilize the rapidly growing student movement for concrete support to the democratic front in the 1938 elections, especially under the leadership of the American Students Union, which permits its local chapters to endorse and support progressive candidates for office.

The sharp division that has developed within the Democratic Party has also seriously influenced developments within the younger Democrats and among all youth who support the Democratic Party. Progressive trends are expressed especially in the support the younger Democrats have given to the progressive measures of Roosevelt and in their participation in the American Youth Congress movement in a number of states.

The development of a strong New Deal wing in many states indicates the need for the closest collaboration of all progressive groups with the progressive sections of the younger Democratic movement. In the South, where a large progressive movement does not yet exist among the white young people, it can find expression through the New Deal wing of the younger Democrats. In the Southern states our Party should give particular attention towards developing the cooperation with progressive groups among the young Democrats and in sharpening the fight against the Tories in the movement.

In Minnesota, tremendous possibilities for organizing the democratic front among the youth exist. Although the Farmer-Labor youth movement numbers only slightly more than a thousand, a Youth Congress movement, embracing tens of thousands, has developed. While working to strengthen and build the Farmer-Labor youth movement, our Party and League must find ways and means to unite these Farmer-Labor youth with young people who follow the progressive wing of the Democratic Party and with the large masses of youth in the Youth Congress, for support of the candidates of the Farmer-Labor Party. In the State of Washington, where approximately 1,000 young people are organized in the youth section of the Commonwealth Federation, our Party and League must also emphasize the need for the closest collaboration between the Commonwealth Federation Youth Section and the progressive young Democrats in support of progressive candidates on the Democratic Party ticket.

WORK AMONG CATHOLICS—A KEY QUESTION IN MASSACHUSETTS

BY PHIL FRANKFELD

State Secretary of the Communist Party of Massachusetts

THERE is one important phase of Comrade Browder's report that I want to deal with. For us, in New

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

England generally, and in Massachusetts in particular, the problem of working among the Catholics is the *key question*. Without the Catholic masses in Massachusetts, there cannot be any successful democratic front established. Unless we succeed in breaking through the wall of prejudice that divides our Party from the Catholic workers, especially the Irish Catholics, and recruit hundreds and thousands into our Party, we shall never become a real mass Party in the state. We are confident that this can be done. It is indicated for us by such attitudes as that of Dr. James T. Gillis, who writes in the *Catholic World:*

"Let us not delude ourselves in thinking that, because the Pope says no Catholic can be a Socialist, we are bound hand and foot to the present capitalistic system. The accusation that Christianity is revolutionary is not altogether unfounded."

In Massachusetts, there are over 1,800,000 Catholics out of a population of approximately 4,000,000. The Catholics constitute the basic sections of the working class. There are hundreds of thousands of Catholic workers in the textile, shoe, transportation, maritime, shipbuilding, building, garment and other industries and trades. In the trade union movement of the state, the Irish and Italians predominate in membership and leadership. In the political life of the Commonwealth the Catholics, especially the Irish, play a most decisive role.

Over 71 per cent of the Church members in the state are Roman Catholics. In cities like Boston, 73.5 per cent of the population reporting religious affiliations were reported as Catholics, while Fall River had 86 per cent reported as Catholics.

Comrade Browder spoke about the "exceptional social organization of the Catholic community." To grasp fully the significance of this statement, let me cite the following facts:

In 1929, there were 693 Catholic Churches and 1,708 priests. There were 264 parochial schools, 79 high schools, 26 academies and six colleges in Massachusetts. The Church has a great network of charitable institutions, including eighteen orphan asylums, sixteen hospitals, nineteen homes for the poor and aged, etc. It is second only to the state itself in the magnitude of its charitable and social activities.

Following the guidance of our Political Bureau and the speech of Comrade Browder in Baltimore, our State Committee has proceeded to make a special study of the Catholic question. At our recent State Convention, it was the very heart and center of our deliberations. We have made a small beginning in starting serious work among the Catholic people and a serious study of Catholicism in the state.

In studying the history of the Catholic Church in Massachusetts in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, we feel that this very history and the traditions of the Church *can become a powerful factor in winning the Catholic people to the democratic front.* The Catholics have had to carry on a consistent, stubborn and self-sacrificing struggle for religious freedom. The Catholics have faced bitter persecution from intolerant and bigoted groups attempting to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

curtail their democratic liberties. Catholics have had to fight not only for religious freedom but for political representation as well.

Periodically, there have been recurring strong anti-Catholic movements in the state. In the 1830's, the so-called Nativist movement was at its height. This was the darkest period in the history of the Church. Persecution of Catholics was intense. Mob violence was stirred up. This found its acutest expression in the burning of a convent in Somerville, by a disguised and drunken mob of fifty men.

In the 1850's, the well-named Know-Nothings were in the midst of their indecent, inglorious activities. In 1855, a Know-Nothing Administration in the State House passed a resolve to conduct an investigation of all Catholic institutions. The work of that "smelling commission," as it was branded, was very similar to the present Know-Nothing Commission that completed its labors only Friday, "investigating" Communism and other "isms." Comrade Browder has already referred to the American Protective Association, which had its strongest base of support in Massachusetts. This organization was conducting its vicious anti-Catholic agitation in the 1890's. More recently, the hooded order of night-shirted cowards had active groups operating in our state. In fact, this year, five fiery crosses of the K.K.K. were found burning in Needham.

It is interesting to note the charges made by all of these anti-Catholic movements in their literature and compare them to the charges leveled against our Party today.

1. Catholics were accused of "being un-American and subject to foreign domination."

2. Catholics "took orders from Rome."

3. Catholics "were alien, ignorant, deceitful, and cruel."

4. "Catholics constitute a menace to our free institutions."

5. "America has to be saved from the Romish peril."

With these traditional charges enunciated time and again against Catholics, we can realize the potency of Comrade Browder's remark about the fact that "some of the Catholic clergy try to wield this double-edged sword against the Communists, oblivious of its dangers to the Catholic community in America."

One point must be definitely understood by us in dealing with these attacks of the various anti-Catholic movements. These attacks were carried on by an insignificant number of prejudiced Protestants. Enlightened members of the Protestant Churches resented and objected to these outbursts of bigotry. In the three periods mentioned above, there were profound economic and social forces at work causing realignments in the political field. These forces made it possible for such movements to develop.

As a result of our discussions and study, we have come to realize several other important aspects of Catholicism. Here I wish to make special mention of the role played by our Catholic comrades in Boston who have

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

helped our Party considerably in arriving at a correct understanding of the Catholic question, and are helping us greatly in working out a concrete approach to the Catholic masses.

* * *

In the early life of the Catholic Church, it fulfilled a great social function for the newly arrived immigrants from Ireland, France, Poland, Italy, and other Catholic countries. These immigrants were without friends. They were (and still are) poorly paid and highly exploited. There were no unions to speak of to protect their economic interests. They turned to the Church as their haven. They found social contact with their fellows. The Catholic workers' deep religious feelings are therefore not only a matter of tradition and training, but one of gratitude as well to their Church. This fact must be always borne in mind.

We Communists can also understand why the Catholics in Massachusetts honor the name of the Catholic Bishop de Cheverus. His life was a shining example of real Christian self-sacrifice and justice, which is not too common today. He tended with his own hands a friendless and poor Negro suffering from disease (at a time when the Negroes were still enslaved). He trundled a wheel barrow at the head of his flock working to build fortifications in Boston in 1812, when a British attack was expected—at a time when Boston Tories were conniving with the British and selling out their country. Cheverus stood for democracy and opposed discrimination against Negroes.

From the earliest days of the republic, the Catholics (especially the Irish) in Massachusetts, have lined up on the side of democracy as against special privilege. The Irish played an outstanding role in the American Revolution against British tyranny. The Irish lined up almost solidly behind the party and program of Jefferson in opposition to the Federalists. In the American Civil War, two companies of Boston Irish won high honors for their heroism. In every textile, shoe, and longshore strike the Catholic workers were in the forefront of the battle. In the famous Lawrence strike of 1912, a Catholic priest granted the use of his Church to the strikers at a time when all other halls were denied to the strikers.

It has been traditional for the Catholics to line up instinctively against the merchants and bankers of State Street, Boston. The Catholic masses never had any use for the blue-bloods and Brahmins who control the Republican Party. Class divisions have always been strong—and still are. The Catholic workers and middle class, almost as a whole, lined up solidly for Roosevelt in 1936. With proper work by the progressives and ourselves, we can look forward to the Catholic people to line up solidly again behind the democratic front in Massachusetts in 1938—against the reactionaries and Tories in the Republican Party, as well as those in the Democratic Party.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT IN CALIFORNIA

BY WM. SCHNEIDERMAN

State Secretary of the Communist Party of California

CALIFORNIA has for 42 years been a traditionally Republican state. But in spite of the war-cry of the Republicans to "save California from Communism," today the overwhelming sentiment of the people against Tory reaction is reflected in the voters' registration figures, which show a 600,000 majority for Democratic registration over Republican. It is predicted that this majority will reach 800,000 when registration closes. In Los Angeles County, the former Epic stronghold, the Democrats show a majority of almost two to one. There, the progressive forces in the Democratic Party have reached a relatively advanced stage in support of a program of the democratic front. For instance, two weeks ago, the Democratic County Central Committee of Los Angeles County, representing three-quarters of a million Democratic voters, adopted a resolution demanding of President Roosevelt the lifting of the embargo on Spain.

But the organization of the democratic front for victory in the elections is not an easy and simple task, due to the extremely complicated political situation and the many factors which still stand in the way of the unification of the democratic forces. We Communists are keenly aware of the responsibility we bear to bring about this unity. We have become an important factor and a recognized force in the labor and progressive movement, and the progressive forces are beginning to appreciate and understand the role we are playing in the building of the democratic front.

During the past year, the first beginnings of a democratic front showed its outline, growing up around the progressive bloc in the State Legislature and the California progressives in Congress, in the struggle for social and labor legislation. This movement spread down below through the organization of hundreds of Democratic clubs throughout the state, developing a wide range of activity and initiative during the election campaign. Today this movement is gathering around the support of Senator Olson, the leading progressive candidate for the Democratic nomination for Governor in the August primaries.

Another important development is the part that the labor movement is beginning to take in political struggles. Labor's Non-Partisan League has in a few months' time become a powerful political instrument of the trade unions, embracing about 200 unions with approximately equal proportions from the A. F. of L. and the C. I.O. The fight of L.N.P.L. for political unity of labor is exceptionally important in California, because the Pacific Coast has been the scene of the most bitter warfare between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. Nowhere in the nation has the criminal splitting policy of the A. F. of L. leadership had such disastrous results as on the West Coast, where they have adopted a policy of a "war to the finish" against the C.I.O. The longshoremen and agricultural and the lumber workers, backbone of the C.I.O., have borne

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the brunt of this attack, resulting in almost daily struggles which often end in strikes and lockouts. It is a tribute to the C.I.O. forces, and especially the militant longshoremen, that in the main, they have more than held their own. But the problem of unity is an exceptionally urgent one, because the reactionary forces have attempted to use this split to launch an attack, not only on the C.I.O., but on all unions. They hope to continue and aggravate this split on the political field, because only in this way can the Tory forces hope to win the elections.

The A. F. of L. leadership has thus far followed a policy which plays into the hands of reaction. When one remembers that many of the A. F. of L. leaders have for a long time been tied to the Republican machine, but dare not openly support the Republican Merriam administration, their tactics in the Democratic Party are seen to be extremely helpful to the Republicans. They have declared war on Labor's Non-Partisan League and all its possible candidates, and formed the A. F. of L. Political League of California. They may even try, if they can get away with it, to endorse both a reactionary Republican and conservative New Deal Democrat in the primaries. This places extremely difficult tasks on the shoulders of the progressive and democratic forces. Labor's Non-Partisan League has only a minority of the A. F. of L. unions in its ranks, although they have withstood every attack and stood their ground when ordered to withdraw from the League. If it makes the mistake of following a narrow, sectarian policy, it will be suicidal for both the success of a progressive victory in the primaries as well as the final elections. The Non-Partisan League has conducted an energetic campaign for political unity of labor, which has had wide repercussions in the A. F. of L., even among leading forces that are dissatisfied with the policies of the reactionary top leadership. The Railroad Brotherhoods have also taken a firm stand which will strengthen the fight for labor unity. The coming state conventions of both Labor's Non-Partisan League and the A. F. of L. Political League within the next few weeks and the decisions they adopt may well determine in advance the outcome of the November elections.

Another problem faced by the democratic forces is the bitter factional struggle within the Democratic Party, which is even more intense than in Pennsylvania. The split in the Democratic Party goes back to 1934, when the McAdoo machine was largely responsible for the defeat of Sinclair and the election of the Republican Merriam. That split, if carried into the 1938 elections, carries the greatest dangers for the victory, not only of the progressive forces, but also of McAdoo in the Senatorial contest. The progressives have carried their resentment to such extremes, that they are still talking of the Democratic Party leadership in California, which is in the main pro-New Deal, as "reactionary." It is true, of course, that the McAdoo forces, which in Congress support the President, have an extremely unsavory record in California politics, which will make it more difficult to mobilize the entire labor and progressive move-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment for the support of some of their candidates.

The progressive forces in the Democratic Party have not yet learned all the lessons from previous defeats, nor the full implications of the methods of establishing a unified democratic front for the defeat of reaction. They have not yet fully learned that the democratic front cannot be limited only to the most advanced progressive elements, that to defeat reaction in the present relation of forces, it must also include all the hesitating and confused elements, and all the vacillating elements who follow the middle of the road and sometimes retreat before the pressure of reaction. We Communists have been carrying on a struggle against a Leftist sectarian approach in this connection, and the results already obtained convince us that unity of all the New Deal forces can and will be established before it is too late.

Another threat to the unity of the democratic front exists in the formation of an abortive third-party ticket. Raymond Haight, the Progressive Party candidate in 1934, who held the balance of power in voting strength between Sinclair and Merriam, is again in the field for the governorship. Our Party played a big part during the past year in isolating his group from the progressive Democrats, whom he tried to win to a third party ticket. But now a new threat has arisen, in the rise of the LaFollette adventure, and the possibility that LaFollette will make California one of his chief stamping grounds in support of Haight.

The adventurous and reckless character of his policy can be seen from the fact that Haight has filed for the Republican and Democratic nomination as well as of his own progressive party, with the avowed purpose of splitting the progressive vote in the primaries, with the fantastic idea that Haight can win the elections if he faces in the finals a reactionary Republican and conservative Democratic candidate for governor. The Democratic forces see this danger, and recognize that such a policy can only result in the election of the Republican candidate, and a victory for reaction all the way down the line. If there is any doubt anywhere in the country about the dangerous implications of the LaFollette adventure, let them look to California for its concrete manifestations, and it will fully bear out the correctness of the analysis made by our Central Committee.

But LaFollette and Haight are not the only ones to "pull a Lemke," as Comrade Browder aptly put it. Townsend is trying to pull another Lemke, as he did in 1936, through the organization of a new Townsend Party which would be closely allied with the Republican machine. But the Townsend voters repudiated this policy in 1936 when they voted for Roosevelt, and we are confident that they will repudiate this policy again in 1938. Our Party has the responsibility to take a leading part in the struggle for old-age pensions and win the Townsendites to the democratic front.

One of the weakest sectors of the democratic front in California is the rural agricultural sections, the stronghold of the Republican Party, of the reactionary, pro-fascist Associated Farmers, an organization of the big

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

growers, and other anti-labor forces. Labor neglected the toiling farmers and their problems and is now reaping the results, and the Communist Party shares this responsibility. Unless this gap is overcome, it constitutes a threat to the victory of the democratic front. There is increasing evidence among the labor and progressive forces that they are aware of it, but not enough has been done as yet to win the rural areas, the small and middle farmers, away from the influence of the Republican Party, although its farm policies have had the most devastating influence on the interests of the working farmers and the disfranchised agricultural workers.

Our Party's recent state convention made this one of the major questions in its discussions; it adopted for the first time a concrete program and a special legislative platform, and resolved to use all its resources to penetrate the rural areas and to convince the broad labor and progressive movement in the industrial centers that it must take up the fight for the farmers' interests and demands, if they are to be won to the democratic front.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

PROFESSOR LEVY'S APPROACH TO MARXISM

A PHILOSOPHY FOR A MODERN MAN, By H. Levy, Knopf, New York, 1938, $2.50.

THE philosophy of Ernst Mach, which achieved widespread popularity in bourgois circles throughout Europe at the beginning of the century, made great inroads in Russia in the reaction which followed the 1905 Revolution. Would-be Marxists such as Bazarov, Bogdanov, *et al.,* became enthralled by this un-Marxian philosophy and eagerly seized upon all the agnostic, idealistic and defeatist ideas which gained currency at the time under the renowned name of Mach—ideas which were natural enough in the bourgeoisie, which looks backward in time, but incongruous and exceedingly dangerous in proletarian revolutionists, who look ahead.

In his great polemical work, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,* Lenin showed that Machian positivism is only idealism in disguise, that it exposes the socialist movement to the inroads of religion, scientific retrogression and reaction, and that it undermines the scientific ground on which the proletariat must march to socialism. He accordingly upheld space, time, history, causation and matter, as the fundaments of the world and refuted the arguments which denied their objectivity or importance. Does matter disappear if it is proved to be nothing but electricity? Lenin replied that such a development of science would disprove only metaphysical materialism which insists upon immutable elements, not *dialectical* materialism which emphasizes the gradual progress of our knowledge of matter. What materialism insists upon is the objective character of matter and its reflection in the mind. In so far as it is dialectical, it encourages every revolutionary advance in understanding. As Lenin quotes Engels with approval:

". . . with each epoch-making discovery in the department of natural science (not to speak of the history of mankind), it (materialism) has been obliged to change its form."

These recollections are of some importance in approaching the new book of Professor Levy, for in the Western world today positivism, idealism, religious reversions and irrationalism have taken on in many quarters a new vogue.

In Lenin's time it was the discovery of radioactive substances which gave excuse for pessimistic conclusions regarding science and rational solutions. Today it is the Quantum Theory and the Principle of Indeterminacy. Moreover, the positivist and skeptical ideas of Hume and Mach, which were rife in 1908, have recently gained a new vogue; while the rising pragmatism which Lenin decisively rejected has achieved great influence in certain bourgeois circles, paralyzing scientists everywhere by its teaching that the scientific mind is tentative, unpartisan, reluctant to organized social action.

There is a further point of comparison. Lenin's time was marked by great discoveries of the sort which he and Engels believed would oblige materialism "to change its form," and the same is true of the present. The General Theory of Relativity, the Quantum Theory, and the development of atomic analysis amount to a revolution in physics. But the extension of probability and statistics to so many fields of science, even to mechanics, though less sensational, is no less important. Here precisely is the contribution of Levy's book. Approaching the teachings of Marxism from the point of view of statistics, and with a technical competence which no one doubts, he demonstrates that even the working scientist, busied with his restricted problems, can, if he is consequent in his thinking, advance a great way in the direction of dialectical materialism. Although incomplete, and needing correction in this particular or that, Levy's approach will doubt-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

less exert a salutary influence on his fellow scientists and the general public and prompt them to further study of the subject.

Certainly no general theory is more in need of Marxian analysis than the philosophical foundations of probability. At present, two schools, neither one of them satisfactory, hold the field. The "objective" probability theory reduces predictions to mere classifications. That a man will probably die in twenty years means only that he belongs to a class of men who have died with a certain frequency in the past. Here the prediction disappears. An assertion about the future is identified with an assertion about a class of men who have lived in the past.

This "relative frequency theory," as it is called, tends to reduce prediction to mere classification, and the calculus it develops is so abstract that it is difficult to assign concrete values, or to connect theory with practice. It is likewise loaded on the side of "empiricism." That is, it is inclined to substitute sensations or experiences for the facts of the material world. In its account of the way in which the probability of an assertion is calculated, it therefore confines itself far too much to the experiences of the investigator in connection with this particular assertion; and thereby neglects the coherence of knowledge and the material, historical context of assertions or events. It is as if a man in calculating the probability of a strike in a certain industry should confine himself to the strike frequency in this industry in previous years. Finding that in a period of twenty years, ten strikes had occurred, he might conclude that the probability of the strike in the coming year was one to two, or one-half. This, of course, would be an incorrect conclusion, because he has failed to take into account the political, industrial and trade union developments, many of which lie outside of the industry in question. No competent investigator would make such a simple mistake. But the example nevertheless illustrates a danger which continually haunts the "frequency" theory of probability—the danger of falsely isolating a subject under investigation.

The other theory of probability, that developed by J. M. Keynes in his *Treatise on Probability,* is also objectionable. For example, it rests upon the so-called Principle of Indifference. This principle states that if the evidence for and against a given event is equal, or if no evidence is available, the probability of its occurrence is one-half. But this, as is often pointed out, is simply an argument from our ignorance and tells us nothing about the material world. The fact that we have no evidence of the existence of life on a distant planet in the Milky Way does not mean that we *know* that the probability of its containing life is one-half. It means that we know nothing about it. This illustrates the kind of subjectivism into which Keynes' theory, in its various developments, so often collapses.

Although Levy does not, by any means, resolve all the philosophical difficulties surrounding probability theory, he does make a new start which is full of promise. The basic term of his analysis is the "isolate" which may be understood as any part of the universe which is taken as a subject of study. A molecule, an apple off the tree or a fish out of water are *atomic* isolates. The isolate, however, is not nearly as isolated as the mechanists suppose. "Indeed, it is precisely *through* the so-called 'theory of errors' of experiment that allowance is made for the linkage between the supposed isolate and the rest of Nature." The atomic isolate is seen to be an item in a larger statistical isolate (or group isolate), but any atomic isolate, in its turn, can be viewed as a statistical isolate with respect to the atomic isolates which compose it.

"In general any isolate can be analyzed down into atomic isolates and qualities relating them." Here the discussion carries over Engels' emphasis on the relatedness of things and the interpenetration of diverse departments of science to the plane of statistics, which is fast becoming the language of the sciences; and systematically corrects the mechanistic fallacies into which the probability theory falls when it restricts itself to part-processes taken as independent. What Levy fails to do is to describe with sufficient concreteness the specific dialectical interplay between particular sciences. This is due in part to his almost exclusive preoccupation with the passage of quantity into quality and his neglect of the other two laws of dialectics. It is also due in part to his unnecessarily abstract method which arranges all isolates—

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

apples, men, scientific laws, strike frequencies, stars and melodies—on levels which differ only in the degree of their complexity. The general discourse about isolates often obscures their irreducible differences and makes it appear that the sciences differ from one another, not by their specific qualitative differences, but only in the complexity of their subject matter. Thus, in combatting mechanism, Levy himself unwittingly falls into a certain mechanical simplification.

This is not always the case. His clear insistence that statistical isolates are every bit as objective as the atomic isolates cuts a broad highway over many of the confusions and futilities of the mechanists.

In Anglo-American philosophical and scientific circles, where empiricism and logical atomism have made such headway, where classes and statistical groups are commonly regarded as fictitious or dubious, there has been a tendency to regard assertions of probability as subjective and inexact because they relate to classes which are distrusted and not to individuals which are accepted as the only realities. As a counteraction of this tendency, we must welcome Levy's contention that the atomic isolate is only relatively atomic and only relatively isolated, that statistical properties of groups such as the mortality rate, or the strike frequency, of a certain city are just as real as the properties of individuals, that statistics is not, therefore, a kind of inexact knowledge, but simply the best method of measuring certain types of objectively changing properties.

The supposition that knowledge of probabilities is inexact or subjective will now be seen to rest upon a mechanistic habit of thought, and in part, upon the exigencies of the mathematical calculus, which falsely isolates the isolate, the coin which is tossed—from the mint, the city in question—from other cities. With all its over-simplification, Levy's scheme of isolates performs good service against mechanist and empiricist trends of thought in the field of probability. The same can be said for his defense of the objective reality of matter, space, time, and causality. Challenged by the attack of British philosophers, Levy rescues the furniture and indispensable appointments of the material world.

After exploring the physical sciences through the lenses of materialism and incomplete dialectic and with the help of his own original scheme of the isolate, Levy turn to the social sciences. In the second part of the book he traces the outlines of the Marxian socio-economic theory (with certain misconceptions which we shall mention later on) in his own individual manner. Possessing a high order of social awareness, he apparently experiences no difficulty, in spite of Professor Dewey's warning, in blending social indignation and partisanship with mathematical calm and integrity. Indeed, one suspects that his partisanship is responsible in no small part for his clear-headedness and realism which Professor Dewey lacks. One instance of his social analysis is his contention that under socialism statistics reaches a new phase. Here for the first time the atoms or individuals within the statistical group consciously and purposively determine the statistical results (*cf.*, the Five-Year Plans) which they predict and to which their lives are subject.

Levy does not pretend that his book is a full account of dialectical materialism, and his mistakes should be judged in that light. He is an eminent scientist working toward the full Marxist position from the very difficult and very illuminating vantage point of his own profession, a procedure which Engels thought desirable and necessary for the development of dialectical materialism. His emphasis upon technological factors in socio-economic evolution at the expense of the class struggle is, of course, misleading. Technological considerations, like geographical ones, have immense importance, but only in relation to socio-economic developments. Inventions which mean prosperity in the socialist economy, entail unemployment in the capitalist. Great natural resources, which lie fallow in Canada, are exploited in the Soviet Union. Levy, of course, would agree. Yet his preoccupation with technology often gives the impression that he regards it as an independent agent in development.

Other shortcomings of Levy's analysis could be cited. Although he has given an interesting statement of the passage of quantity into quality in terms of modern physics and statistics, he fails to make use of the full Marxist analysis of motion and change, and his attempt to boil down the three laws

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of motion into one basic law is decidedly unsuccessful.

"Consider," he says, "a given state or situation—*S*, in which there resides a certain quality *Q* which is undergoing intensification. *S* has an internal structure or composition of such a nature that the intensification of *Q* arouses in it or intensifies in it a structural quality *Q*. The quality *Q* is recognized by the fact that its intensification is inimical to the continued existence of the given state *S*. Accordingly at a critical stage of *Q* the state *S* is transformed by it into a new qualitative state *T*. The transformation is made manifest by the fact that what was given for the state *S* no longer has relevance. The immediate cause of this intensification of *Q* to its critical value is *Q*; the immedate cause of the transformation is *Q*. A change-over brought into being by an internally aroused agency such as *Q* is referred to as a dialectical change . . . the actual quantitative point of *Q* at which the dialectical change occurs is referred to by dialectical materialists as the point at which 'quantity passes into quality,' or more shortly as the dialectical point." (P. 117.)

In criticism of this statement it must be said that it plainly does not apply to all cases of change. Indeed, the statement itself refers to change taking place before the "dialectical change." Furthermore, the passage of quantity into quality does not exhaust dialectical change. All change is dialectical, even the movement of bodies in space. In his effort to fuse together into one law the passage of quantity into quality, the interpenetration of opposites, and negation of negation, Levy has weakened and distorted the latter two principles and confined their operation to a single phase, which he wrongly calls, "the dialectical point." Every point is a dialectical point. Every phase of motion is a unity of opposites. This principle is as old as Heraclitus (sixth century B.C.) and it is a pity that Levy did not make full use of it. Engels and Lenin put the principle very clearly. Lenin, for example, remarks in a famous section of his notebooks that "the condition of the knowledge of all processes of the world as in 'self-movement,' in spontaneous development, conceived in its vital and living form, is the knowledge of the unity of their opposites. Development is 'struggle' of opposites." (*On Dialectics.*)

Levy's definition of "quality" as a relation of one thing to other things is also wrong, and leads, if carried out, to the absurd idealistic conclusion that only the Absolute exists (*cf;* Bradley, *Appearance and Reality*). For, if the qualities of things are only relations to other things, everything has its nature in everything else and, therefore, exists only as a distorted fragment of the Absolute. Everything less than the Absolute is therefore appearance, only the Absolute is real. This, of course, is mystical nonsense. What Marx says in *Capital* is not that a property of a thing consists in its relations to other things, but only that it reveals itself in them, or through them, as for example, through the senses.

But these mistakes, and a number of others could be listed, are, in the opinion of this reviewer, far less notable in a book addressed not primarily to Communists, but to a wide general public, than its positive achievements. It is highly likely that the present trend toward dialectical materialism on the part of distinguished British (and American) scientists will continue and that theoretical shortcomings will be ironed out in the process.

PHILIP CARTER

AMERICAN LABOR'S COMING OF AGE

LABOR ON THE MARCH. By Edward Levinson. Harper & Brothers. New York. 325 pp. $3.

MANY are by now generally familiar with workers' conditions in the mass production industries which gave rise to the successful industrial union movement led by the C.I.O.

Less familiar, at least to the general reader, are the stratagems and antics of the A. F. of L. high command which discouraged the earlier birth of an industrial union movement in the labor upsurge of 1933-34.

Because it traces in detail and documents the steps by which the craft union leaders smothered the labor militancy of the N.R.A. days, Levinson's book is in this respect one of the best exposures of the A. F. of L. Executive Council which has appeared in any of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the recent books dealing with the labor movement.

It will be remembered that there were growing A. F. of L. unions of auto, steel, rubber, electrical, aluminum and other workers in the mass production industries in 1933-34, before the C.I.O. had even been thought of.

But defeatism and ineffectiveness characterized the "efforts" of A. F. of L. organizers assigned to these fields by Bill Green. This is not to mention their downright fears of the militancy and enthusiasm of these new recruits to the labor movement. ("Rubbish" is how one craft leader contemptuously described the newly-won mass production workers.) The new unions continued to make headway despite all the handicaps placed in their way by the Executive Council. They progressed until they struck the snag of narrow craft unionism.

The steel workers, for example, had long had jurisdiction over that industry, thanks to the leadership of William Z. Foster in 1919, which forced the A. F. of L. craft unions to waive their paper claims over various crafts in the steel industry. The steel workers' union grew to 100,000 in the days when the workers accepted Section 7a at its face value. But craft claims, long forgotten, again cropped up as the Whartons and Tracys saw a chance to cash in on juicy per capita payments for which they had not extended themselves an inch. They simply asked that workers organized into the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers be transferred to their own respective unions, without regard to the fact that this would cause a fatal weakening of the steel workers in their struggle to unionize this basic industry.

Labor on the March relates this and scores of other examples—the attempts to relegate lumber and electrical and radio workers into a class B status; Green's foisting of "leaders" on the auto and rubber workers in their early stages. (This arbitrary and undemocratic appointment of leaders from the top by Green himself ought to give the final answer to those who believe his false cry that the C.I.O. is "undemocratic.")

Levinson reviews the forces at work in the A. F. of L. conventions since 1934, the illegal delegation of authority by the Executive Council to suspend the C.I.O. unions for fear that, should they remain, the next convention would see the craft leaders defeated. He traces the strategy and growth of the C.I.O., its victorious struggles in the auto and rubber industries, and its consequent tremendous influence. The author leaves no doubt that the guilt for the split in the labor movement lies squarely with the leaders of the A. F. of L.

But in his final chapter, Levinson's bias leads him to deliberate misrepresentation of the role of Communists in the trade unions. One has by now been accustomed to such actions on Levinson's part inasmuch as he has in recent months been exploiting his labor editorship of the *New York Port* openly to electioneer against rank-and-file slates in certain New York unions by means of Red-baiting, for the purpose of advancing the interests of the Socialist-Lovestoneite-Trotskyite blocs in these same unions.

Despite the fact that Levinson's book pretends to decry Red-baiting, he himself repeats the choice slanders of the despicable Stolberg. "Communists," Levinson declares, "shape their labor union policies from a Party line dictated by the needs of Soviet Russia in the field of international relations and from a belief in the infallibility of Stalin."

By the Soviet Union's international relations policy, the author, no doubt, has reference to the policy of collective security, aid to Spain and China, etc. Yet Communist advocacy of these policies in the trade unions has as its basis *the interests of the American and world labor movements.* It is to the everlasting credit of the Soviet Union that it champions this cause. For while the isolationism of Mr. Levinson and his Socialist-Trotskyite-Lovestoneite friends may not be "dictated" by the Party line of Communism, it dovetails very well with the line of Hitler and Mussolini.

Another Levinson gem:

"In New York within 24 months they [the Communists] denounced certain racketeers within a group of A. F. of L. restaurant unions, then denouncing District Attorney Thomas E. Dewey for prosecuting them, formed a united front with racketeers. When Dewey succeeded in jailing the racketeers, the Communists reemerged as their critics, took

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over their jobs and ended up with both feet on the Dewey bandwagon."

Levinson cannot plead ignorance to the libel that the Communists in the New York food unions cooperated with the racketeers. He knows as well as anyone that it was the Communists who fought the racketeers in the unions for years, that they were expelled from these unions for their pains, and that when they returned while the racketeers were in control, they won over many of the rank and filers and succeeded in helping to clean the fakers out. The tremendous growth of these same unions since that time attests to the correctness of such tactics *in the interests of the unions.* What would Mr. Levinson have had the Communists do, retire from the unions and leave the racketeers in undisputed control, with the workers at their mercy?

Levinson utters another slander when he reports that "the Communists . . . did not attempt to hitch their wagons to the C.I.O. star until the spring of 1937." As one who was present at the 1935 A. F. of L. convention in Atlantic City which saw the birth of the C.I.O., Levinson knows that Socialists and Communists as well as other progressives conferred together and were the staunchest supporters of the industrial union bloc. More, it was the Communists, champions of industrial unionism since the Party's birth in this country, who urged that the fight be not dropped with the Atlantic City convention, but be carried on into action. True, the Communists did not support the premature breaking away of some A. F. of L. unions to join the C.I.O. because *they had the interests of a united labor movement at heart,* as they have today in urging trade union unity.

Were this not so, the Communists would not be held in the high regard which is theirs for the "good organizing job" they did in "some unions" as Levinson grudgingly admits. Levinson's bias leads him also to the remark that the sympathies of Lundeberg of the Sailors Union of the Pacific—whom the Socialists and Trotskyites were backing—are "clearly with the C.I.O. rather than the A. F. of L. . . ." How ridiculous this is can be seen from the fact that Lundeberg destroyed the Sailors Union votes which overwhelmingly favored C.I.O. affiliation and has since sent pickets against the C.I.O.'s National Maritime Union, and otherwise played into the hands of Joe Ryan and the A. F. of L. bureaucracy.

It is these typically malicious and lying statements in Levinson's last chapter which mislead the unwary reader and vitiate what might otherwise have been for the most part an accurate history of labor's coming of age.

R. W. TURNER

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Read More About

MARXISM-LENINISM

in Hundreds of Books, Pamphlets, Magazines for Sale at These Bookstores and Literature Distribution Centers

Aberdeen, Wash.: 115½ West Heron St.
Akron: 39 *E. Market,* Room 304
Baltimore: 501a N. Eutaw St.
Berkeley: 2475 Bancroft Way
Birmingham: 1907 N. 5th Ave.
Boston: 8 Beach Street
Buffalo: 75½ Chippewa St.
Butte: 119 Hamilton St.
Cambridge: 19 Dunster St.
Camden: 304 Federal Street
Chicago: 200 West Van Buren
1326 East 57th St.
Cincinnati: 540 Main St.
Cleveland: 1522 Prospect Ave.
Denver: 522 Mining Exchange Bldg
Des Moines: 218 Youngerman Bldg.
Detroit: 2610 Clifford St.
Duluth: 28 East First St.
Grand Rapids: 319 Bridge St.
Greensboro, N. C.:
315½ So. Elm St., Rm. 6
Hollywood: 652 N. Western Ave.
Indianapolis: Meridan Life Bldg., Room 401
Los Angeles: 226½ S. Spring St.
2411½ Brooklyn Avenue
Madison, Wisc.: 521 State St.
Milwaukee, Wisc.:
914 N. Plankinton Ave.
Room 1
Minneapolis: 631 Third Ave., So.
Newark: 216 Halsey St.
New Haven: 38 High Street
New Orleans: 130 Chartres St.
New York: 50 East 13th St.
Oakland: 491 10th Street
Oklahoma City:
129½ W. Grand Ave.
Omaha: 301 Karbach Block
Paterson: 201 Market St.
Philadelphia: 104 So. 9th St.
Pittsburgh: 508 Court Place
Portland, Ore.:
323 S. W. Salmon St.
Providence: 335 Westminster St., Room 42
Racine: 205 State Street
Reading: 224 North Ninth Street
Richmond, Va.: 301 No. 1st St.
Sacramento: 1024 Sixth St.
St. Louis: 3520 Franklin Ave.
St. Paul: 26 E. 4th St.
Salt Lake City: 74 W. 1st, So.
San Diego: 635 E St.
San Francisco:
170 Golden Gate Ave.
1609 O'Farrell St.
15 Embarcadero
San Pedro: 244 W. Sixth St.
Santa Barbara:
208 W. Canon Perdido
Seattle: 701 Pine St.
Spokane: 114 No. Bernard
Superior: 601 Tower Ave.
Tacoma: 1004 Tacoma Ave.
Toledo: 214 Michigan
Washington, D. C.: 509 G St., N. W.
Youngstown:
114 E. Federal St.

●

Write for a complete catalog to any of the above addresses or to

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS

On the INTERNATIONAL List

The July Book—

THE PERIL OF FASCISM:

THE CRISIS IN AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

By A. B. Magil and Henry Stevens

320 pages $2.00

A study of current political tendencies and the rise of the democratic front in the United States, including a brilliant expose of big business as the fountainhead of incipient fascism, with its various terrorist, fascist and reactionary groups and organizations exhaustively described. This book is the key to a clear understanding of the forces in the 1938 election struggle. Every American will want to read it.

Other INTERNATIONAL Books—Just Published

LIFE OF LENIN

By P. Kerzhentsev

A new, popular and authoritative biography by a veteran Soviet journalist and historian

336 pages $1.75

●

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

By V. I. Lenin

Writings and speeches on the Third International. Volum X of the Selected Works of Lenin

$2.00

For Summer Reading—

The Spider and the Clock, by S. Funaroff

Paper $.35; cloth $1.00

Collected Poems of a Leading Proletarian Poet

The Way Things Are, by Albert Maltz $1.50

A book of stirring stories of the class struggle in the U. S.

●

Order from your bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED